

Class

232.1R

Book W733

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

1847

JESUS AND THE FUTURE

JESUS "AND THE FUTURE

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE ESCHATOLOGICAL
TEACHING ATTRIBUTED TO OUR LORD IN THE
GOSPELS, TOGETHER WITH AN ESTIMATE OF THE
SIGNIFICANCE AND PRACTICAL VALUE THEREOF
FOR OUR OWN TIME

BY

EDWARD WILLIAM WINSTANLEY, D.D.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

SOMETIME

CROSSE SCHOLAR IN DIVINITY, ETC.

AND INSPECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE DIOCESE OF LICHFIELD

AUTHOR OF

"‘SPIRIT’ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT"

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1913

THE
PUBLISHED BY

T. & T. CLARK

EDINBURGH

232.1R
W 733

57907

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
JAN 19 1900

PREFATORY NOTE

THE study which this book contains has developed from a series of lecture-sermons given some years ago in a town parish in the south of England. These were on the subjects of the Advent and the Judgement, and formed the starting-point for a study of all the evangelical material of an eschatological nature.

At that time I endeavoured to take the defensive line of attributing the apocalyptic element largely to the prepossessions and misunderstanding of the reporters; but I have been gradually compelled to relinquish that apologetic argument and to acknowledge that this teaching is for the most part authentic and reliable as the actual setting of the Gospel of Jesus.

Meanwhile the conviction deepened that the most satisfactory line of solution for the difficult problem was of the nature of a *via media*: to recognise the eschatological form, but yet exhibit the inherent and permanent doctrine as independent of the primitive conditions of the Gospel message.

This has led me to apprehend increasingly the value of the Johannine interpretation, which, freed from the limitations inevitably associated with the age of its

production, affords a solution of practical mysticism which is virtually timeless and universal, and with which the general trend of modern religious thought seems most in sympathy.

In some such way the balance has to be struck between the eschatological and ethical "schools" of interpretation, seeing that each has brought out (and probably exaggerated) one side of the truth.

In publishing this work, I do so with the hope that the understanding of our Lord's outlook and teaching may be increased thereby.

Lastly, I have to tender cordial thanks to my friend Professor F. C. Burkitt for helpful suggestions during preparation for the press.

EDWARD WM. WINSTANLEY.

ROOSENDAAL, WOLVERHAMPTON.

CONTENTS



INTRODUCTION	PAGE I
------------------------	-----------

CHAPTER I

ERRATUM.

Page 206, line 22.—*For* Dr. Rendel Harris *read*
Dr. M. R. James.

CHAPTER IV

THE SON OF MAN (*continued*)

<i>D.</i> The Ascription of Judicial Functions—	
(<i>a</i>) Directly	149
(<i>b</i>) By Applications of the Parables	161
<i>E.</i> The Personal Use of the Term	167
<i>F.</i> Man as such	181
<i>G.</i> The Son	194
Note on the "Little Apocalypse" material	205

CHAPTER V

RESURRECTION AND LIFE

<i>A.</i> Teaching about Resurrection—	PAGE
(i) The Subject in General	209
(ii) The Resurrection of Jesus	217
<i>B.</i> The Doctrine concerning Life	220
<i>C.</i> Indirect Teaching—	
(i) The Future of the Blessed in Figures	229
(ii) Their Place of Abode	246

CHAPTER VI

JUDGEMENT AND ITS ISSUES

<i>A.</i> Direct Instruction	253
<i>B.</i> Indirect Teaching—	
(i) The Abode of the Ungodly	268
(ii) Figures of the Condition of the Condemned	277

CHAPTER VII

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHING AS A WHOLE

<i>A.</i> General Survey	294
<i>B.</i> Traces in the Primitive Preaching, etc.	322

CHAPTER VIII

THE JOHANNINE INTERPRETATION 332

CHAPTER IX

PRACTICAL REFLEXIONS

<i>A.</i> The Revaluation of the Eschatology	356
<i>B.</i> Its Relative Nature	380
<i>C.</i> The Utility of its Concrete Presentation	385
<i>D.</i> The Permanence of the Ethics	395
<i>E.</i> The Worth of the Individual	399

INDEX

(1) References	405
(2) Subjects	414

JESUS AND THE FUTURE



INTRODUCTION

AMONG the thoughtful laity of to-day, both men and women, the spirit of inquiry is being manifested with reference to the outlook and teaching of our Lord concerning the future. In other words, there is an evident desire to face the problems of the Eschatology of Jesus—His doctrine of “the last things” of the then existing age and of its issues for men—in view of the critical treatment of the New Testament on the one hand, and of the changed world-view of the modern man on the other.

The eagerness of public attention and the earnestness of private questioning have convinced the present writer of the prevalence of an interest in the subject which is both sincere and practical. It is for this reason that he is desirous that the following chapters should be available not only for specially trained students of the New Testament and of Christianity as such, but should have a wider and more general appeal, and therefore the passages which constitute for the most part the

data from which to form our opinions on the subject are presented in English dress, instead of being transcribed in Greek. For when we endeavour to ascertain the teaching of Jesus in regard of a matter of such vital and personal interest, and strive to learn what we can preserve "to profit withal" for our own time, how we may best estimate its permanent validity, and how we may best account for the local and temporary features which possess but a secondary and non-essential value, it is necessary to examine somewhat closely those presentations of "the Gospel" which we term "Gospels."

Moreover, we must do this in order that we may be enabled to apprehend clearly the various aspects of future events and conditions which were most prominent in our Lord's doctrine, and thus be prevented from falling into the error of giving every part of the subject or even every reference in the Gospels the same value.

We must admit, however, that in any such investigation and balancing of probabilities it is impossible, constituted as we are, to eliminate the subjective element of personal judgement, even though we set out with every intention of fairness.

It has been the experience of the writer during a considerable number of years in which the matter has had a living, practical and personal interest for him both as pastor and student that, when brought up against the hard facts of life, thoroughgoing theories of Gospel eschatology break down one after another

and fail to work out ; partly because of the vast range of the subject, partly because of the lack of homogeneity and of completeness in the records available, and the consequent scantiness of the material at our disposal for clear-cut and assured conclusions.

Furthermore, in addition to these hindrances and difficulties we must reckon with the fact that we have, firstly, no means of attaining certainty as to the *ipsissima verba* of the Master, mediated as they were through oral and written reports of devoted followers who could not be expected to gain an adequate comprehension of the loftiness or the breadth of His teaching, and could not shake off the prepossessions of their up-bringing or free themselves from the influence of popular beliefs around them. Such prepossessions and influences could not but be felt and have their effects in the transmitting of oral material as well as in connexion with additions and corrections and alterations of form when the words had been already committed to writing.

Secondly, we are frequently left without any definite evidence as to the occasion on which certain words were spoken. Their position in a narrative may not necessarily arise from a sequence strictly chronological ; but it may be due to the place in which they were found in a composite collection of sayings—in a series of utterances linked first in memory by the association of ideas or by the recurrence of a striking word, and then combined with a framework of events ; or, as in the case of the records of Matthew and Luke, the

succession may be derived from the order of a continuous narration on the lines of which later authors have constructed their own story.

Apart from these elements of doubt, it is still more hard to localise correctly editorial additions brought in from written or oral sources which we have no longer the means of tracing.

Thus for the sake of any who might expect to discover a well-ordered scheme, system or symmetry of doctrine with regard to the future derivable or deducible from the extant fragments of our Lord's teaching, it is fitting to utter at the outset a word of warning, that they may not be disappointed.

A reverent caution and a non-committal attitude seem therefore to be urged upon us by the very difficulty as well as by the solemnity of the subject of the inquiry upon which we are engaged, and because of the practical issues which compel us to shrink alike from undue positiveness and from rash speculation. Often the disposition of Job appears most suitable, and we prefer to "lay our hand upon our mouth."

Once more, it has been imperative, in order to keep the range of this work within bounds, and to avoid an overweighting of the subject-matter and the confusion of many references, to exclude any full dealing with that unsystematised mass of speculation—some spiritual, some childish, grotesque and crude, but for the most part ardently patriotic—which goes to make up the apocalyptic, and characterises indeed in part the latter

Rabbinic, literature of the Jews, except in so far as reference is demanded by similarity of teaching to words reported to have been spoken by our Lord. Thus the complicated and often inconsistent views and statements connected especially with the Resurrection and with the Judgement and its consequences have not been exhibited, because many points upon which such a diversity of opinions were expressed were not dealt with—indeed, as far as our records tell us, were not referred to—in the positive and broad teaching of Jesus.

We have to seek our path in a region where the well-marked roads upon which many authors have trodden in succession are few, and the tracks and byways are many, leading to no useful goal. Into these latter we would not wish to lead the reader; for it is our desire to keep in the forefront the practical and religious value of the doctrine of Jesus for the modern man.

The writer is not aware of any like attempt to examine critically and also to interpret, in view of changed modes of thought and modern difficulties, for our own time the outlook of Jesus.

To lay open, after due sifting of the material, the permanent value of our Lord's doctrine concerning the future, separated from its inevitable and temporary limitations, has been the writer's intention. And fearless faith will be found only to reveal a grander universal and personal hope as the guerdon of patient inquiry.

The utterances of our Lord which reveal to us His eschatological outlook, His teaching relative to the end

of the age, the issue of His own earthly life and the commencement—and more—of the coming age, fall conveniently into three main groups for our investigation.

We have first of all the future as expressed in terms of the Kingdom or Rule of God, and that in manifold aspects of its proximity and characterisation.

Then we must examine our Lord's revelation as regards Himself in the immediate earthly future and in the age to come by means of the passages concerning the Son of man.

From the doctrine of the Kingdom and of the Bringer thereof we pass naturally to the instruction to be gathered from the sayings and stories of Jesus as regards the states of men after its establishment. And this subdivides into two parts—(I.) The teaching with regard to the subjects of the Reign of God, apprehended through the utterances concerning the Resurrection and Life, together with other terms and figures expressive of bliss; and (II.) that relative to those unworthy to be included therein, suggested by the allusions to the Judgement, and by various figures expressive of woe.

For this part of the inquiry we shall restrict ourselves to the synoptic records of our Lord's teaching.

We shall then be in a position to summarise the characteristic features of the outlook of Jesus, and also to inquire if we can derive any additional information

on the subject from the accounts of primitive Palestinian preaching, or from the writings traditionally ascribed to personal associates and to relatives of our Lord.

After this it will be expedient to set forth and indicate the trend and worth of the re-interpretation of the doctrine of Jesus which the Fourth Gospel affords.

Finally, we shall have to endeavour to estimate the significance for the modern man of the teaching which has been investigated, and also the practical and permanent value of it in spite of the very different outlook which marks our own time.

As has been implied already, this study has not been undertaken to establish any preconceived theory or to attempt to support any hypothesis, but solely to present with an impartial scrutiny what appear to be the facts, and then seek to interpret them afresh in the light of modern knowledge, and apply them to modern needs.

Nevertheless, there are some common assumptions which seem to be demonstrated by the inquiry to be at least open to question.

One, for instance, is the usually unqualified statement that the Son of man title was only used by our Lord of Himself, and not also applied to Him afterwards by others—Christian teachers and Gospel-writers—as well as by St. Stephen, according to the record in the Acts.

Another is the almost universal assertion that our Lord taught that He would Himself be the final Judge of mankind ; unless the silence of much of the material is to be interpreted as signifying His acquiescence in an accepted doctrine, and as reflecting also the consensus of later Christian opinion, it at least demands more recognition and serious consideration.

Further, the fact that the Fourth Gospel is rather a devout and profound interpretation of history than historical in our modern scientific sense has had a tendency in recent years to diminish the appreciation of the "spiritual Gospel." But its drawing forth of the permanent inwardness of the doctrine, discoverable beneath the primitive eschatological forms, renders its re-valuation peculiarly in sympathy with the tendency of modern religious thought, and thereby enhances vastly its present worth.

Finally, it appears to be very generally assumed that grievous loss would be incurred religiously and ethically if the primitive form of eschatological doctrine were to be relinquished. Yet it is rather the meaning of, the truth underlying, the apocalyptic phrases and symbols which possesses lasting validity.

The general point of view to which we have been gradually led in this work may be mistaken ; but assuredly progress in dealing with a difficult subject like this arises from the disagreement of thinkers who are alike earnest and sincere.

The present writer ventures to submit very humbly

that the final word has not by any means been spoken on these matters, and that it is possible in the interest of clarity of thought concerning our Lord's teaching, and of the world-wide and growing religious movement towards a spiritual interpretation of the universe as well, to demur to the foreclosing of such questions.

CHAPTER I

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

IT would appear to be imperative that any careful and systematic attempt to apprehend the outlook of our Lord upon the future should commence with an investigation into the material in the Gospels which deals directly with the subject of the Kingdom of God.

At the outset, in order to avoid a lengthy recapitulation of the development of the Jewish hope of the rule of God—whether by the agency of a restored Davidic state or in a more directly theocratic form—it would be well to indicate some assumptions which seem to be established.

First, we take it for granted, without traversing trodden ground afresh, that Jesus attached His teaching to the current popular conceptions, concrete and crude though they may have been, and built up His transforming doctrine on that basis. As far as we know, He never found it needful to define what He meant by the Kingdom “of the heavens.”

Again, we assume that the difference between this term—peculiar to the first Gospel—and the Kingdom “of God” is not conceptual, but only linguistic; that it

is most probably the reverential use of one of the various circumlocutions for the unpronounced divine name. But this does not exclude the possibility that our Lord used the term God, which would naturally be found more suitable in reporting His teaching for Gentile-Christian listeners and readers (Mark, Luke).

Further, we accept it as true that Jesus took up the burden of the message of John the Baptist by opening His ministry with a similar proclamation of the immediacy of the Kingdom of God.

Before we address ourselves to the consideration of the data for this part of our subject, it will make for simplicity of treatment if we group the material at our disposal, seeing that it is more rich and comprehensive than that relating to the Kingdom or Rule of God, either in the apocalyptic or Rabbinic literature of the Jews.

Chronological sequence suggests that the passages relating to the announcement of the Kingdom should be dealt with before those which afford indications of the time of its coming. Then the newness of the teaching of Jesus must be exhibited, the transmuting of popular expectation, the "mystery" which His followers were to reveal. This will bring us, lastly, to the consideration of the ethical nature of the eschatology of Jesus as manifested in the conditions of entrance to the Kingdom. Thus it will be found that every allusion receives treatment under one or other of these headings:—the Preaching of the Kingdom (*A*), its Coming (*B*), its

Potential Presence (*C*), the Mystery of it (*D*), and the Conditions for entering therein (*E*).

A. THE PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM

In the accounts which the Synoptists give of the message and work of John the Baptist only the briefest retrospective summary of his words is afforded to us, and we are left to infer the content of his nation-stirring appeal. Occupied with the subject of the deeds and words of his greater successor Jesus, the Marcan and Lucan records simply state that he came "proclaiming the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins" (Mk 1⁴, Lk 3³). That the urgency for penitence on the part of his people and the sealing of it by a symbolic act of cleansing was on account of the imminence of the Kingdom, and therefore also of the terror of judgement, they regarded as being understood of itself. Luke, indeed, from his Palestinian information, adds specimens of John's mode of dealing with different classes in view of the impending divine judgement which was evidently a prominent feature in his message (Lk 3¹⁰⁻¹⁴). Matthew, however, recounts the gist of his proclaiming in direct speech: "Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand" (3²). But the impelling motive for repentance is the fact that the dominant feature of the imminent Kingdom is "the coming wrath," individual judgement. The three successive acts, penitence, confession, baptism, would avert God's wrath when His instrument for the establishing of the Kingdom came, and on the other

hand would ensure participation in the spiritual outpouring associated with that coming which was so near; if indeed the Baptist spoke of "holy spirit" at all (cf. Ac 19^{2f.}), except under the figure of wind for the winnowing (Mt 3^{11f.}). Whether the actual expression put into his mouth by the compiler of the first Gospel was used in the preaching of John we cannot be sure, but that the Kingdom for which Israel longed (cf. Lk 2²⁵) was central in his message we may be very certain, because the divine judgement was inseparable from the manifestation of the divine rule, although opinions indeed differed as to its temporal position in the eschatological scheme. This only too concise sum of the message of John is of importance also because it is peculiarly akin to the Matthean summaries which we meet with relative to the teaching of Jesus, and the same formula may well have been ascribed retrospectively to the mission of the Baptist. If that be so, the reference is of value in that it shows that in the opinion of the Jewish-Christian circles from which material was derived the initial proclamation of Jesus was, as has been assumed, essentially the same as that of John.

1. The first intimation of the content of the opening proclamation by our Lord is provided by the words: "After that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, proclaiming the gospel of God, (and) saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel" (Mk 1^{14f.}). Matthew, however, having noted the removal from

Nazareth to Capernaum, and having applied to that event one of his testimonies from prophecy, records with the utmost brevity: "From that time began Jesus to proclaim and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand" (4¹⁷). Here the words "Repent, for" are not beyond doubt (syr. sin., etc. omit). Now, while these two writers agree in placing the call of the first disciples immediately after this bare summary of the earliest preaching, Luke merely recounts (4¹⁵) continuous teaching on the part of Jesus in the Galilean synagogues, and expresses its effectiveness by saying that He "was glorified of all"; while for a sample thereof he gives the dramatic Sabbath scene in His native town, with the gist (in LXX language) of an address based on the glad tidings of the Messianic age as delineated in one of the passages which probably concern the Servant of Yahweh (Is 61). Obviously we are dealing here with the briefest indication of what was conceived in the days of committing the narratives to writing to have been the purport of the earliest message, before Jesus associated any disciples with Himself; just as a similar reference is reported to have been made to the Spirit-worked outward tokens of the incoming Messianic time connected with His own ministry by way of reply to the Baptist's inquiry (Mt 11⁵). But the Marcan form, "repent and believe in the gospel," suggests Christian missionary activity rather than the initial terms of a proclamation of the impending advent of the reign of God.

It is likely enough that the nearness of the Kingdom was the point of contact between the public appeal of John and of Jesus, although no mutual agreement as to the essentials of their message has any basis in the primitive tradition; indeed, the question of John from prison (Mt 11³) is very strong evidence against any such assumption.

That the concise Matthean summaries of the Lord's missionary preaching are drawn up almost to a formula we may apprehend from that one which closes the story of the Galilean tour "preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people" (4²³), and prepares for the introduction of the discourse material gathered together in the "Sermon" chapters. So also we find the same expression "the gospel of the kingdom" in the very similar *résumé* of the itinerary previous to the charge to "the twelve disciples" (9³⁵), and it recurs in the unique statement incorporated in the eschatological address: "this gospel of the kingdom shall be proclaimed in the whole inhabited world for a testimony to all the nations" (24¹⁴).

Thus the phrase is used in the first Gospel alike for the teaching of Jesus and for the burden of the missionary message of the Church, although the central feature was in the one case the Kingdom, and in the other the Christ, the Son of God.

2. There is thus no direct report of *ipsissima verba* from the opening Galilean proclamation of Jesus common

to the synoptic writers, but this fact affords us no reason for doubting the essential correctness of the belief of the second generation that the public appeal to the nation was based both by Jesus and the Baptist upon their confidence in the imminence of a crisis which was none else and none less than the divine in-breaking of the long-looked-for new age. Moreover, we may infer that this was the subject of that "evangelising" by our Lord of which Luke is fond of speaking. Thus he represents Jesus as telling the importunate crowds who brought His quiet retirement "in a desert place" to an end: "To the other cities also I must preach-the-good-tidings-of the kingdom of God, for therefore was I sent" (4⁴³). The term *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is only attributed to Jesus here in speaking of Himself; and this shade of meaning, however appropriate for Hellenistic converts, hardly befits the rousing of a district to readiness for a crisis by warning and exhortation. The implied reference to a divine mission (cf. p. 295 f.), even of the prophetic type (*ἀπεστάλην*, cf. Gal 4⁴), is evidently less original than the Marcan term (*ἐξῆλθον*) for His leaving Capernaum on a tour whose object is "proclaiming," the content thereof being left undefined (1^{38f}, cf. Mt 4²³ above).

3. Luke, again, is alone (8¹) in the generalisation concerning the Galilean itinerary of Jesus, which introduces his account of the ministering women: "He went-about-through city and village, proclaiming and bringing-the-good-tidings-of the kingdom of God." With this may be compared the same author's peculiar statement

that after the return of the apostles from their journey of preparation, Jesus "welcomed" the multitudes that followed them to Bethsaida, and "talked (impf.) to them of the kingdom of God" (9¹¹). On this occasion the other writers are quite indefinite: "He began to teach them many things" (Mk 6³⁴), while the "compassion" to which Matthew refers (14¹⁴) may be presumed to have included teaching in its exercise.

These generalising statements, extreme in their brevity, afford us rather reflexions of a later age than the direct traditions of ear-witnesses; but the internal evidence of the records of our Lord's teaching justifies the accuracy of the summaries, although the words in which they are expressed may not indeed reproduce the terms actually used by Jesus in the proclamation of the Kingdom.

We must now review such instructions to the disciples for the guidance of their mission-preaching as have been embedded in the traditional material. These too are mainly Lucan in transmission.

1. In his report of the charge to "the twelve" when they were "sent forth," Luke tells us that our Lord bade them "proclaim the kingdom of God and heal" (9²), following up this brief command with the details concerning their simple equipment for speedy and un-resting travel in order to compel attention and arouse expectant enthusiasm. Moreover, he adds at the close that in their village journeyings they "evangelised and healed everywhere" (6). But the third Gospel, we

remember, affords also in the material accumulated from various sources of written and oral information, and narrated in connexion with the "journeying to Jerusalem" (9⁵¹), a second or rather variant dismissal-address (probably from Q, the Query-document or "Quelle," the undefined "source") to "other seventy (-two)," who are also represented as being "sent forth in pairs" on a similar preparatory mission "to every city" (10¹).

Their work in each place visited is to "heal the sick and say, The kingdom of God is come nigh upon you," while to the unreceptive the fact of the nearness of the Kingdom is to be reiterated as a final warning (9, 11^b). Such indifference, says Jesus in an aside, if it be authentic in this connexion, will merit a worse fate than that of Sodom (12).

We may not be able to say with certainty whether Luke duplicates the charge and hints in the second at the "evangelising" of non-Jewish peoples, or—as seems more probable—reproduces and edits consecutively traditions found in Mark and in Q. But we shall not be far wrong if we infer that the original instruction has become considerably coloured in transmission by the experiences of apostolic and other missionaries.

Furthermore, the Matthean parallel indicates a combination of sources, for the author collects his material into one charge to those pioneer disciples who were to announce two by two the coming of Jesus Himself

to reinforce their own preliminary message of the Kingdom.

Only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" are they to go, excluding the Samaritans—and this restriction is to be regarded as genuine, harmonising as it does with the customary limitation of our Lord's own ministerial work, while the burden of their preaching is to be, "The kingdom of the heavens is come nigh" (10^{8f.}). It is not to be expected that these instructions would be retained exactly in their original form; they would become in the primitive Christian propaganda a little manual of direction for missionaries.

2. For reliable information about the content of this initial apostolic preaching we are inclined to interrogate the reminiscences of Petrine teaching probably contained in Mark. There we find the evidently authentic emphasis on rapidity of movement and simplicity of equipment, but the burden of the proclamation of the emissaries of Jesus is assumed to be familiar, doubtless the coming crisis, the nearness of the Kingdom (6^{7ff.}). The writer's *résumé* of their activity gives repentance as the sum of their exhortation—in view of the catastrophe impending for the unfit—and notes also successful exorcisms and healings (12^{f.}).

Although we are well aware that there was plenty of time for development and addition even in the Marcan record as we have it, yet this penitence cry which is implied has the ring of the primitive proclamation of Jesus Himself, in order to rouse the national conscience

and to prepare the people as widely as might be for the imminent divine manifestation, the object of national hope. This appears to be confirmed by the anticipatory narrative of the choosing or "appointing" of the twelve for personal training, and then for "sending them forth to proclaim" the well-known message in widening circles (3^{14ff.}). It is noteworthy that the usage of powers of exorcism (and other healings) is authorised according to all accounts as a token of the divine justification of their tidings. The very silence of Mark as to the details of the initial apostolic proclamation, coupled with the use of the term "repent," which implies an impending judgement inseparable from the coming of the Kingdom in power, only serves to support the general trustworthiness of the interpretation of Luke and Matthew, that the Kingdom formed the main subject of the preaching.

3. Thus far we have had no certain verbatim report of a command from our Lord's lips to preach the Kingdom, but Luke affords one which purports to be such. In agreement with Matthew, presumably from the second main source Q, he relates the coming of a would-be disciple to Jesus, and then the summons to follow addressed to one who expressed in proverbial terms his shrinking from immediate adherence. To the latter is given the firm response: "Leave the dead to bury their dead, but go thou and publish abroad (δι'ἀγγελλεῖς) the kingdom of God" (9⁶⁰).

This is definite enough, but suspicion is aroused by

the Lucan term, and Matthew has instead the terse behest "Follow me" (8²²) before the words which take up the temporising reply. True indeed it is to the spirit of the teaching of our Lord that discipleship demands missionary effort, but the fuller form may be regarded as due to the evangelist (cf. Ac 21²⁶, of Paul announcing the fulfilment of his vow in the Temple courts). A further confirmation of the correctness of the supposition that the original retort was simply "Follow me" is furnished by the case immediately succeeding (although related in Luke alone), when some one else breaks in with "I will follow thee, master"; only he is desirous, like Elisha of old, of bidding farewell at home. But even this act contains the risk of adverse persuasion: "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (9^{61f.}). In view of the inference contained in Luke's preceding interpretation, we may say that the fitness is capable of a special implication here, that of fitness for proclaiming the coming Kingdom, although this does not exclude the wider meaning of fitness for citizenship in the community which was to be divinely established. We have found, however, the special aspect of preparation by preaching already prominent at the opening of this same chapter, both in relation to the disciples (²) and in relation to our Lord (¹¹).

4. Another very strong though again indirect proof that the coming of the Kingdom was central in the preaching

of Jesus and of His emissaries alike is supplied by the difficult passage about John the Baptist. "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the kingdom of God is preached" (*εὐαγγελίζεται*, Lk 16¹⁶). The Matthean parallel (11^{12f.}), however, has not this reference to "evangelising," but implies the grasping of the Kingdom already so near to its manifestation by the valiant men of faith and prayer—zealots in a good sense—who are just the ones to be hastening the fulfilment of God's purpose by the urgency of their preaching its imminence to others. The actual words of the context and the exact meaning of this utterance seem to have been unknown to both evangelists, and their diverse attempts at arrangement and explanation only help to authenticate the statement as such. Matthew works it into a continuous utterance about John in a way which will compel us to revert to this passage in connexion with the time of the advent of the Kingdom (p. 46 f.). The circumstances of the second generation seem to have affected the Lucan form of transmission.

5. Once more, Luke furnishes us with an allusion to the preaching of the Kingdom, in a manner explicable by the Marcan phraseology—also probably secondary—in reporting the same utterance. In answer to Peter's very human but not elevated conception of reward for discipleship and missionary service our Lord tells them: "There is no man that hath left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of

God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this time," etc. (18²⁹); while Mark, after a slightly different list of what is relinquished "for my sake and for the gospel's sake," promises a hundredfold of the same "with persecutions" (10^{29f.}), thereby implying a similar interpretation that preaching activity is inseparable from close discipleship, although the Matthean form "for my name's sake" (19²⁹) may indicate that the simple yet sufficient personal touch "for my sake" is the most likely to have been original in addressing His immediate followers. But Matthew may not have been correct in fact in attaching this promise to the saying, apparently from Q, about sitting upon twelve thrones (28).

6. Three references peculiar to the first Gospel remain to be considered as implying the apostolic duty of proclaiming the message of the Kingdom. The first is interpretative. In the explanation of the parable of the Sower that which is heard is termed "the word of the kingdom" (13¹⁹), where Mark has simply "the word" (4¹⁴) without further definition of nature or content. That the message is divine in origin is the note of the Lucan report: "the sowing is the word of God" (8¹¹).

Evidently in the course of the teaching activity of the Master the message required no description for the disciples; but the later interpretation by means of the explanation ascribed to our Lord is obviously correct. For the readers of the Gospel narratives the sowing was

already complete, and the members of the Christian communities were coming to regard themselves as in some sense constituting the Kingdom.

7. Again there is a saying which, apart from the uniqueness of its transmission and the question of the appropriateness of its setting, is sufficiently striking to be self-authenticated. "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of the heavens' sake" (19¹²). This appears to refer to the breaking of earthly ties and the relinquishing of ordinary callings for the purpose of close discipleship and for the proclaiming of the nearness of the Kingdom. The utterance, accepting it as authentic, might reflect the exquisite pain of our Lord's own experience in leaving His trade as a carpenter and the home in Nazareth at the divine summons. That the saying is attached here to the Marcan passage about divorce (10²⁻¹²), which it does not really suit, need not make us hesitate to attribute it to Jesus, nor because it is in harmony with the growing reverence for single life at the time of the compilation of the Gospels.

8. Finally, we have Matthew's peculiar phrase, previously noted, "the gospel of the kingdom" in a universalistic verse inserted in the so-called Jewish-Christian apocalypse: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be proclaimed in all the inhabited world for a testimony to all the nations, and then shall come the end" (24¹⁴). That this alludes as it stands merely to declaring the glad tidings to Jews of the Dispersion can

scarcely be held adequate; indeed, it but defines and strengthens "and unto all the nations first must the gospel be proclaimed" (Mk 13¹⁰), which in itself seems clearly to reflect the catholic (Pauline) ideal (cf. 28¹⁹), and to betray a Christian standpoint of expectation.

The foregoing preliminary survey of references from double or single evangelical tradition has at least made us realise that, although the majority of the passages are not definite reports of direct speech, but consist of compendia or interpretative phrases due to the compilers, the theme of the preaching of Jesus and of the announcement by His disciples in His name during His earthly lifetime was the proximity of the rule of God in manifest form and power; and the primary need in view of this coming crisis was repentance, fundamental and not merely ceremonial. We cannot admit that this reiterated evidence, weak though it may appear in isolated instances, is anything but cumulative when looked on as a whole. It strengthens the impression—to say the least—that this identity of interpretation which we discover in the Synoptists, in references two-thirds of which are peculiar, as to the content of the proclamation initiated by John, developed and transmuted by Jesus, could not have been mistaken. For it deals with that which was central in the primitive tradition from pre-crucifixion days, but was soon succeeded by the Church's glad tidings of the risen Lord. Nor have we any reason to suppose that the writers of the Gospels were wrong in representing the

preaching of Jesus as at first in essential agreement with that of John.

B. THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM

When we consider the references which have been collected in the previous section relative to the preaching of the Kingdom by the Baptist and by Jesus, by the apostles and by the earliest missionaries, it may be regarded as a justifiable and indeed an inevitable inference that the object of the proclamation was an event still future, whether near or remote. This would appear to be a fact, even granting that most of the allusions are indirect and interpretative; exhibiting also in the expressions used by the narrators a change of tone and of emphasis which was but natural by reason of the intervening events of the Death and Resurrection of the Lord and the spread of the Christian communities.

But now it behoves us, quite apart from this prepossession, to investigate briefly yet carefully all the direct statements concerning the Kingdom of God (or of the heavens) attributed to our Lord in the various strata of the evangelical tradition.

(a) Near

First of all, let us review the utterances which imply that Jesus looked for the manifestation of the rule of God in some more or less catastrophic and

concrete form in the near future, within living experience.

In our survey we will pass step by step from the common traditions—which may be presumed to be more impressive and reliable—to those relevant passages which are found only in single transmission. Although there is internal evidence which prevents us from believing that the second Gospel as we have it is exactly in the form that was used by the later compilers, we shall do well to work with the Marcan record as the basal source, both because the other Synoptists follow its order, and because from the nature of the case the reconstruction of the second source Q can never be wholly certain, unless some discovery should reveal to us its actual range and contents.

1. All the accounts agree that after the apostolic confession of the Messiahship of the Master and the subsequent revelation of His consciousness of triumph through suffering, in whatever terms the latter may have been originally indicated, and immediately before the record (or insertion) of the account of the Transfiguration, Jesus proclaimed clearly that some definite manifestation of the reign of God, the new age, was assured within the lifetime of those (or “some” of those—if this be not a later adaptation) who heard Him. The utterance was too significant to be forgotten, but the exact connexion of it may not have been accurately preserved. “There are some here of them that stand by who shall in no wise taste of death until

they see the kingdom of God come in power" (Mk 9¹). Luke keeps the saying in the same context, and only omits the closing and perhaps additional words "in power" (9²⁷). Matthew also preserves the connexion, but interprets the declaration manifestly from the later Jewish-Christian standpoint: "till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (16²⁸). The Kingdom, existent in the divine purpose, will be demonstrably brought amongst men on earth within the present generation. Matthew doubtless altered the wording in accordance with the expectation in his own time of the return of Jesus as the Messiah "in his glory" (Lk 9²⁷, D). The present position of the saying in the records gave rise quite intelligibly in later days to the application thereof to the immediately succeeding vision of glory in the Transfiguration. It must be admitted that the utterance was just of the nature to call forth the disciples' question about the advent of Elijah before the manifestation of the divine Kingdom (11^{ff.}). This would mean that the story of the event on the mountain did not belong here in the original form of the tradition.

2. Again, all the accounts agree that at the Last Supper some reference was made to a meal or banquet (which included the drinking of wine) "in the kingdom of God." This primitive apostolic reminiscence is not affected by critical discussions as to a dual record of the so-called "institution." After "This is my blood . . . which is outpoured on behalf of many," Mark's narrative

continues: "Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (14²⁵).

Luke varies the phrasing slightly by the words "from henceforth" (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, cf. 69) and "till the kingdom of God come" (22¹⁸); but he associates the same thought with the eating also: "I will not eat it (*sc.* the Pass-over just at hand) till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (16), as if the Messianic feast were regarded as imminent after His death, of which He is now assured. Matthew gives to the closing sentence a turn of his own—apart from the variation "henceforth" and the more definitely realistic "this fruit": "until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father" (26²⁹). The conception of the incidence of the Kingdom is thus fundamental and common to all the reports. Such a saying was neither likely to be forgotten in Jewish-Christian circles, nor would it have been invented. The expression of the unfulfilled desire to have partaken of the paschal meal again may or may not have been uttered as Luke reports it; but the firm conviction remains that the death felt to be inevitable will bring about the glorious reign of God in which all that the popular sensuous conception of a happy feast for the pious Jews crudely adumbrated would be more or less immediately realised.

3. Once more, all the accounts agree—at least by implication—that the in-breaking of the divine rule in manifest glory and universally recognised power would

take place before the existing generation passed away. Circumstances soon compelled this belief to be adapted and reinterpreted. It must have belonged to the pre-crucifixion memories; indeed, it must have been the expression of the Master's own confidence. The second generation would not have conceived it, and its preservation testifies to the faithfulness and reliability of our main sources. Now there are verses which are placed near the close of Mark's eschatological chapter (13^{28ff.}) which appear to be erratic blocks of genuine utterance, bearing witness by their very irreconcilability with the previous context to their own authenticity. After the "little apocalypse" (see Note, p. 205) comes the brief similitude of the fig-tree and its trustworthy promise of approaching summer, and coupled therewith is the application to the signs of the end and of the incoming new age, although that is left undefined: "know that it is near—at the doors. Verily I say unto you that this generation shall not pass away until all these things be accomplished" (29f.). Verses that seem inharmonious in this connexion concerning the permanence of the "words" of Jesus, and the ignorance of "the Son" as to the exact time of the end follow (31f.). Teachings on watchfulness form a fitting conclusion, which afforded an opportunity for later expansion. Luke interprets the verse in question (29) of the nearness of the Kingdom, and with complete justification; for so closely connected were the coming of the Messianic kingdom, the divine judgement, and the

transformation of the new age, that no one view was predominant in Jewish speculation as to the order of their emergence; they might be treated as virtually coincident. "When ye see these things coming to pass (*γινόμενα*), know ye that the kingdom of God is near," and so on, identical with Mark, but for *μέχρις οὗ* being replaced by *ἕως ἄν* (21^{31f.}).

In this instance that which is nigh is left undefined by Matthew as by Mark, and in the sentence concerning its immediacy they are in exact agreement (except for *ἕως ἄν* with Luke). Supposing that the end originally contemplated was the destruction of the Holy City, and not of the Temple alone (Mk 13² 14⁵⁸), that would be regarded by the disciples as only a prelude to the final catastrophe which would usher in the triumphant Kingdom. Nor is this the only interpretation which Luke supplies in the same context. Before the fig-tree parable he describes the approaching crisis from a Christian standpoint as "redemption" (28), and that which is coming as a snare he defines as "that day" (34). But the point to notice here is the close proximity of the irruption of the divine Kingdom into mundane affairs, and that is unaffected by the manner in which that crisis, originally expressed in vague terms, came to be defined.

The imminence of the divine visitation, disastrous for the unrepentant, may be illustrated also from well-attested passages which do not name the Kingdom in so many words, but involve the judgement which is

associated therewith by Jesus as well as by the Baptist. The utterance about the evil treatment of the prophets in the past appears in the dual transmission, and evidently was contained in the second source.

It concludes with the words: "Yea, I say unto you, it (*sc.* their blood) shall be required of this generation" (Lk 11⁵¹; cf. Enoch 47⁴). Matthew has the same, only more pointedly expressed, at the close of his collection of denunciations against the Pharisees: "Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation" (23³⁶), "upon you" (35).

The author appends here the apostrophe on the fate of Jerusalem (^{37ff.}) which Luke attaches to the reference to that city as the fitting place for a prophet's death. This he incorporates in the Journey material (13^{33ff.}), and thus appears to have accounted it as a definite prediction at an earlier date of our Lord's being "perfected" in a very short time ($\tau\tilde{\eta}$ $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$, ³²). While on the one hand we may say that there would be a natural tendency at a later period to refer allusions to the catastrophe that would usher in the Kingdom to the fall of Jerusalem, yet on the other hand the various phases associated with the former event were inextricably interwoven for the contemporaries of Jesus; but to Him at any rate judgement on the city seems to have been an inseparable accompaniment of the emergence of the new age. This is confirmed by Luke's unique but not therefore baseless account of our Lord's weeping on the occasion of the so-called

"Triumphal Entry" (19^{41ff.}), although the form indeed may have been affected in composition or transmission by the event.

4. We shall not be far wrong if we add to this evidence from the dual tradition the main petition of the Lord's Prayer, which is for the hastening of the advent of the Kingdom on earth (Mt 6¹⁰, Lk 11²), for assuredly by the petitioners the event for which they have foregone all must be regarded as very near rather than dimly remote. (Cf. ancient Jewish prayers, *e.g.* *Kaddish*; Singer, *Daily Prayer Book*, 75 ff.)

5. It is incumbent upon us now to consider such passages of single transmission as state or imply the proximity of the Kingdom, apart from those to which allusion has been made already in connexion with the preaching of its near approach.

Luke attaches to the urgent charge to the disciples to "seek the kingdom" a strong encouragement not to fear: "for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (12³²), followed by injunctions to sell all and give alms, and await in readiness the crisis. If this saying came to the author from personal Palestinian reminiscences and is authentic, it is only paralleled by the appointing of a sovereignty to the disciples later in the same Gospel (22^{29f.}). At any rate, it is not in place in the Sermon material in which the first Gospel rightly or wrongly includes the command to seek the Kingdom above all things (6³³).

In the second Lucan reference we have the words:

"And I appoint unto you a kingdom (*i.e.* sphere of authority, dominion), even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (cf. for Messiah's dominion, En 52⁴ 62⁶). Whatever be the exact meaning of these words—and they will have to be noticed in another connexion—it is evident that both references involve the expectation of the bestowal of dominion within the lifetime of the individuals addressed, and therefore may be used as a testimony for the belief in the Kingdom in which the followers of Jesus as the Messiah should share. This is not to deny that Christian experience may have affected the form of the latter saying.

We have admitted in the previous section that the references included as applicable to the preaching of the Kingdom, relative to fitness therefor (Lk 9⁶²) and to abandoning home ties, etc., for that purpose (18²⁹), are not susceptible of such an interpretation only; but if they are of more general application, they still bear witness to the proximity of the coming crisis.

6. Although it may appear at first sight unfavourable, there is little doubt in the present writer's mind that the remarkable statement reported by Luke alone concerning "the kingdom of God within" or "among" men should take a prominent place in the evidence for the expectation and doctrine of Jesus that the Kingdom was nigh. Let it be granted that as it stands "for behold, the kingdom of God is *within*

you" is the more accurate literal rendering of ἐντός (17²¹). But the whole context demands "in your midst," and it would be rash to say that the setting, otherwise harmonious, is entirely wrong, or that the utterance is wholly unrelated thereto. The Pharisees are represented by the Lucan apocalyptic source, be it Q or not, as asking a very probable and quite definite question from the proclaimer of the Kingdom: "When will it come?" The response is virtually this: "No calculation or watching for signs of its approach will avail anything, nor will men ever be able to tell one another that it has appeared in this locality or that; for behold—before any can tell the news—the Kingdom is in your midst, all in a moment" (20^f). Then our Lord is represented as giving further information to the disciples to the same effect: "Days will come . . . men will say . . . there! here!" but when the divine manifestation does occur there will be no doubt of its presence among men: it will be like the lightning, dazzling, momentary and world-wide (22^{ff}). The actual wording of the transmission may have been influenced by the vivid and earnest expectation in the early Church of the return of Jesus in glory, but that is no reason for seeking an interpretation relative to the mystic inwardness of the rule of God, which, however true experimentally, is not only quite alien to the context but an anachronism in thought. Moreover, the comparisons of the world-wide flood (26) and of the sudden overthrow of Sodom (29)

demonstrate at least the way in which the evangelist or his source interpreted the passage.

In the doctrine of Jesus, as we shall see later on, the inwardness, without exception, consisted of self-fitting by preparation and activity, not in an individual and internal manifestation of divine sovereignty. Fully harmonious with this is our Lord's clear repudiation of an exact knowledge of the time of the Kingdom's advent, termed "that day" (Mk 13³²).

We may, indeed, speak rightly of the rule of God in each human heart that longs amid prayer and service for the divine consummation; but in the Gospels it is the message which is received within, and developing bears fruit in life, while the Kingdom itself comes from God in His time and in His way, with consequent woe to the indifferent and joy to those transformed by its proclamation. What is really "within" is the state of heart, as the result of "hearing the word," which marks those worthy to be "sons of the kingdom" indeed; but the subjective condition—although manifesting itself objectively in a manner the exact reverse of that of the wayward and unreceptive man (Mk 7^{21ff.})—is not and cannot be called in language conformable to the primitive Palestinian tradition "the kingdom of God."

7. Perhaps we ought not to pass unnoticed before closing these quotations from the third Gospel the words attributed to the dying robber: "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into (in) thy kingdom" (23⁴²; cf.

22²⁹, Mt 13⁴¹). They are not, indeed, words from the teaching of our Lord, but whether authentic or not they bear witness to a familiar knowledge concerning His announcement of a kingdom which was about to break forth upon an unready people. Even the response intimates that the time is in God's hand, and both speaker and penitent must await it.

8. The foregoing peculiar instances which demand or suggest the incidence of the Kingdom in the near future are from the Lucan record; but the wording of the last one adduced recalls another mention of the Kingdom in relation to Jesus Himself which is afforded by Matthew.

In response to the request of (according to him) "the mother of the sons of Zebedee" that our Lord would "command" that her two sons should sit on His right and left hand respectively in His kingdom (20²¹), Jesus makes no denial that the Messianic kingdom (or the "glory," according to Mk 10³⁷, who leaves the demand to the sons themselves) would become present in concrete earthly manifestation during the lifetime of the petitioners. It is therefore indirect testimony to the expectation of its early advent. Moreover, whatever may have been the original form of the request, the reply of Jesus shows clearly that not only the bestowal of position in the coming dominion is the Father's prerogative and not His, but it implies that the Kingdom itself is God's alone.

Thus did our Lord strive to correct their limited

though patriotic conception of a Messianic reign, and manifest the insufficiency of the current literalistic language. The apparent endeavour of the first evangelist or his circle to shield the primitive apostles from the charge of material ambition, only testifies to the antiquity and reliability of the tradition of such a demand on their part: it emanated from a time previous to the transforming of the idea of the Kingdom in the Christian community. Jesus in His response would deepen and spiritualise the brothers' crude and material notions by asking them if they realise "the cup" that has to be drunk (cf. Mk 14³⁶) and "the baptism" that must be endured (cf. Lk 12⁵⁰) before there can be any thought of sharing His throne in the glorious Messianic kingdom, whatever that figure may have signified to Him. It is, to say the least, not improbable that the conviction of their ability to do so, and the statement that they should thus actually share His suffering and His violent end under the symbolism of the cup and the baptism, may have received a more definite form owing to the execution of one (Ac 12²) or—if any credence can be given to the very late report of a tradition in Papias—both of the sons of Zebedee.

It is worthy of remark that this indirect allusion to the near approach of the Kingdom is the only one in the first Gospel besides the passages (common or peculiar) which refer to the original preaching of the message of its proximity, and the very mode of the mention of the Kingdom here reflects the expectation

of the establishing of a kingdom by the return of their glorified Lord (cf. 16²⁸ 24³). This phenomenon serves to show that it is no fancy to observe that this Jewish-Christian Gospel, while preserving primitive Palestinian material, exhibits also undoubted traces of the stage when the Kingdom is at least in process of becoming identified with its present if partial manifestation in the Church on earth.

The last passage under consideration serves to remind us of the purely nationalistic idea of the Kingdom which emerges in the pilgrims' cry at the entry into Jerusalem, the non-refusal of which acclamation by our Lord was evidently regarded later as a public acceptance of the Messianic title. The interpretative tradition of the reiterated "Hosanna" cry fluctuated in Jewish-Christian circles. Mk. looks to "the coming kingdom of our father David" (11¹⁰); Mt. directly identifies "the coming one" with "the son of David" (21⁹, cf. Did 10), and combines prophetic testimonies to the event (Zec 9⁹, Is 62¹¹); in Lk. "the king" is welcomed (19³⁸); while the Fourth Gospel calls him "the king of Israel" (12¹³), thus retaining the local limitation, despite the general rejection in that book of the national Messianic ideas. These expansions of the words of the Psalmist's supplication (118^{25f.}) betray the primitive conviction that the manner of the entry testified to a claim to Messiahship on the part of Jesus, which may be historically well founded, although His conception thereof would be very different from that of the crowds

accompanying Him on that occasion. For the subsequent discussion in the precincts of the Temple demonstrates clearly that if the Messiah were indeed "son of David" he was also much more than that term was usually taken to convey (Mk 12^{35ff.} ||).

(b) *Indefinite*

We have now to consider such references to the Kingdom in the teaching of Jesus as do not afford by themselves any clear indications of nearness, but are either indefinite or generally eschatological in bearing.

1. Looking first, as has been our wont, for evidence from the threefold transmission, we discover a passage common to all the Synoptists in the same context and reproduced in very similar words. After the utterances relating to divorce narrated by both Mk. (10¹⁻¹²) and Mt. (19¹⁻⁹), and apparently associated with a ministry beyond the Jordan, the others follow the Marcan lead (and here Luke takes up once more the order of the second evangelist) in recounting the bringing of the little children to Jesus—an episode which will be noted again in connexion with the character requisite for the Kingdom, and then narrate the arrival of the eager rich man with his question: "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" (Mk 10¹⁷, Mt 19¹⁶, Lk 18¹⁸). After his crestfallen departure all agree in the sad comment which our Lord addresses to the disciples: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God" (Mk 10²³, Mt 19²³, Lk 18²⁴). The following

verses bear traces of confusion in transmitting, and the Western order in Mark (10^{25. 24}) supplies better grounds—unless, indeed, ²⁴ be secondary—for the intense surprise of the hearers, who were accustomed to associate prosperity with divine favour. The phrase “enter into the kingdom of God” is used thrice in the present text of the dialogue according to Mark, twice by Matthew and Luke. The interchange of the terms “life” and “the kingdom” will have to be noted again below. The reason for bringing forward the passage here is to draw attention to the naming of the Kingdom by both questioner and Jesus as something quite familiar to popular belief and indefinitely future.

2. In the group of sayings on self-offence, incorporated by Matthew in a condensed form (18^{8f.}), and also in a variant transmission (5^{29f.}), as well as by Mark, but not contained in Luke—rather because of unsuitability for readers of Greek training than because he did not find the paragraph already in his primary source, we have a similar fluctuation between the terms “the kingdom” and “life” expressing the future state without defining the proximity or remoteness in time of its commencement. Of this future condition “life” no doubt emphasises the personal aspect, and marks the supreme blessedness of the Kingdom. In highly figurative language our Lord impresses on His hearers the tremendous importance of not permitting physical capacities good in their lawful and regulated use to lead the self astray. Hand, foot and eye are taken as

typical of propensities for wrongdoing, so that, in exaggerated imagery, it were better to be rid of these and even die with such physical defects—a problem for the doctrine of the resurrection body to Jew, Christian and Muslim alike—than thereby to hinder one's fitness for "entering the kingdom of God" (Mk 9⁴⁷, Mt 18⁸ "life"). Here the lack of time-definiteness is quite intelligible, for the standpoint is that of the individual in view primarily of existence beyond death.

3. There is another reference very little later in the Marcan narrative (on this occasion shared with Luke) relative to "entering the kingdom," without any emphasis on the time of its manifestation, but with the whole stress on the childlike character essential for the "reception of the kingdom": "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a child, he shall not enter therein" (Mk 10¹⁵, Lk 18¹⁷); thus supporting the preceding statement that "of such" as the just welcomed little ones "is the kingdom of God."

Seeing that the phrase here seems to be a pregnant expression for receiving into the heart the message concerning the Kingdom and letting it work its benign preparatory transformation of the earthly life, it might have been classed under allusions to the preaching of the Kingdom, but the timelessness of the warning to the unchildlike justifies mention here. Such recipients might be regarded as prospective citizens, and only

so far is the Kingdom present ideally in them. The revelation is to babes (Mt 11²⁷), and such "see" the Kingdom's approach (13^{16f.}, Lk 10^{23f.}). Comment on the significance of the above saying as throwing light upon the conditioning character for citizenship in the divine community must be reserved at present. A closely similar instance, also without note of time, occurs in Matthew (18¹⁻⁴), suggested by the disciples' question as to relative greatness "in the kingdom of the heavens," which was answered by our Lord in an acted parable with a child at His side, enforced by the warning that only the childlike in heart will enter into that Kingdom, and so the true standard of greatness for divine acceptance is humility. This episode, it will be noted, leads up in the Matthean grouping to the sayings on offences to others and to oneself. Probably on account of its inclusion in this context, Mt. omits the allusion to the "reception" of the Kingdom after his record of the children being brought to be blessed (19^{13f.}).

4. Two other Marcan passages deserve attention. One relates the approbation bestowed by the Lord on "one of the scribes," who came with a question about the commandments and "answered discreetly": "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" (12³⁴). The commendation does not appear in the other condensed records of the occurrence (Mt 22³⁴⁻⁴⁰; cf. Lk 10²⁵⁻²⁸, a similar story — probably a variant from the second source—in quite a different connexion, in which a

"lawyer" is commended, and the question which called forth the parable of the Good Samaritan ensues).

The man could not be "far from" the rule of God as an inward, spiritual and present state, nor could he be further in time from an external advent than other men. Evidently the phrase has the deeper implication of nearness to that condition of character which befits the would-be citizen of the Kingdom, whose coming is taken for granted, but the time thereof is not defined. This episode will therefore require inclusion also in the teaching on the ethical qualifications for the Kingdom.

5. The other allusion is not indeed from the doctrine of Jesus, but is contained in the evangelist's description of Joseph of Arimathæa as one "who was looking for the kingdom of God" (Mk 15⁴³). In this characterisation Luke agrees (23⁵¹), and it is conformable to those expressions true to local expectation which he uses in his introductory chapters of Symeon and of those to whom Anna was wont to speak ("looking for the consolation of Israel," 2²⁵; "looking for the redemption of Jerusalem," 38).

Matthew draws the inference that Joseph was already "Jesus' disciple" (27⁵⁷), which may be taken to imply at the least that he joined the little band of faithful ones after the Resurrection. That to "see the consolation of Zion" was a current Jewish mode of designating the hope of national salvation in the dawn of the coming age is testified by Apoc Baruch (44⁷). It will be readily

understood that this turn of phrase might reflect a consciousness of the close proximity of the Kingdom's advent, and therefore be classed more suitably with the passages indicating nearness; but, as the national longing had been cherished by pious souls for generations, we may well leave it as indefinite in respect of time, although to the evangelist it would not be so.

6. Perhaps it is best to discuss among these references which are uncertain as to time-definition the relation of John the Baptist to the Kingdom, although Luke, as we have remarked already (p. 22), associates with his appearance the commencement of the preaching of the Kingdom and so its nearness (16¹⁶). But after the mission of disciples from John to ask whether Jesus were really "The Coming One," because of the news of the words and works of the Prophet of Nazareth which had reached him in his prison, our Lord bears striking testimony to the personality and functions of John (Mt 11^{7ff.}, Lk 7^{24ff.}). At the close He is reported to have used the emphatic words: "Verily I say unto you, There hath not arisen among them that are born of women a greater than John (the Baptist); yet he that is lesser in the kingdom of the heavens is greater than he" (Mt 11¹¹).

Luke's change in the first clause is merely stylistic: "greater among women-born than John there is none" (7²⁸); the rest is verbatim.

Now, while there is evidence both direct and indirect

of the small realisation in the Gentile-Christian communities of the second generation of the uniqueness, independence and importance of the Baptist's work, the apologetic of the second source and the attitude of the Fourth Gospel, as well as the experience of St. Paul at Ephesus, bear witness to the strength and wide distribution early in Palestine and later in Asia of John's followers. These facts only serve to corroborate the authenticity of a saying difficult as this is to interpret with certainty.

But it will be found that the general attitude and teaching of Jesus lead us to regard the Kingdom to come as ideally present only to prophetic vision. Our Lord contrasts intuitively the glorious condition of the citizens of the divine dominion when it shall be established with the lot of the greatest of its human heralds. When, however, the Church began to be regarded as a temporary stage upon earth in the establishment of that Kingdom which should one day be consummated by the glorious return of the Lord, we can readily understand how "in the kingdom" would come to be applied to, and would be taken to signify, membership of the Christian society.

The further saying which is attached here by Mt. (11¹²) is quite differently located by Luke, and the later standpoint of both authors renders it difficult for them to interpret. The Lucan form has been noticed (p. 22) among the passages relative to the preaching of the Kingdom, and the context will require further mention

among references which seem to imply the actual presence of the Kingdom (p. 63), and as illustrating in some way (cf. 13²⁴) the spirit of those who are acceptable (p. 85).

The Matthean connexion between these sayings (11^{11ff.})—linked only by the common allusion to John—appears to be merely editorial and artificial, and is rendered more improbable by the wide separation of their occasion according to the opinion of Luke or his source (7²⁸ 16¹⁶).

Thus we regard the immediately following encomium of the Baptist in veiled terms as contrasting the future realised by Jesus in His own mind with the past ending with the activity of John, which ushers the dawn of the new era; although it may have become the prevalent interpretation at a later period to suppose the contrast to be with the actually present condition of things—an explanation which fails to justify itself, because it would have been quite unintelligible to the original hearers of the utterance.

7. The thought of the greatness of the privilege of those who are within the Kingdom leads us on to the allusion by Jesus to the tradition—no doubt related to and coloured by ancient mythological material—of the feast which the true worshippers will share with the Deity and with each other in the future. Matthew attaches it, as in his opinion apparently a universalistic comment, to our Lord's praise of the exceptional faith of the centurion who possessed a paralysed slave, in the

story commonly regarded as part of Q—if any narratives were originally contained therein: “And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall recline with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of the heavens: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth (*v.l.* come forth) into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth” (8^{11ff.}). Only the former part requires consideration at present. Luke incorporates the double saying in inverted order and with some consequent repetition, which may be due to a subsequent insertion of these verses. He attaches the “there” to the place of those excluded in the preceding simile—eschatologically interpreted—of the householder shutting the door on the late and unworthy comers: “There shall be . . . when ye shall see . . . and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without. And they shall come . . . and from the north and from the south, and shall recline in the kingdom of God” (13^{28f.}). The ground for their exclusion will have to be noted later. This version is more definitely catholic; but if Luke had found the story about a presumably Gentile “God-fearer” linked already with this universalistic comment in his source, it is hardly likely that he would have thus dissociated them. But that which is to be observed now is the fact that the Kingdom in both cases is an eschatological object whose time of manifestation is left undefined, unless we choose to press the Lucan “ye” as signifying the certainty that

the joy and the misery respectively would be experienced by the hearers.

8. Luke affords us another reference to the banquet in the Kingdom of God, which deserves attention because it exhibits one aspect of the current notions about the looked-for Kingdom, although the utterance is not that of Jesus, but is reported as a guest's remark serving to introduce our Lord's parable of the "great supper." After the counsel of Jesus to the host to invite such as were incapable of recompensing him on earth, and the additional encouragement of divine reward "in the resurrection of the just," a fellow-guest is represented as ejaculating: "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" (14¹⁵). Evidently the event is an object of popular expectation in the indefinite future. This current pious hope in a more sincerely earnest and urgent form is reflected in the attribution by the same evangelist of the uttering of the later parable of the nobleman and the "pounds" to the feverish anxiety of certain people who are not defined, but who were also typical of the disciples and of the Christians at a subsequent period (Ac 1⁶). A twofold reason is given on that occasion: "because he was nigh unto Jerusalem, and (because) they supposed that immediately the kingdom of God was to be manifested" (19¹¹). The parables of this later context allay the unprofitable excitement by emphasising the fact of the delay being for an unfixed interval, which therefore demands (as we shall see in another

chapter, p. 82) constant readiness by its very uncertainty.

We must be prepared to grant that the grouping and the words alike may have been affected by the necessity of warning over-anxious Christians (cf. 2 Th 2²), although the feeling may have been true enough of eager members of the Pharisaic party during our Lord's ministry (cf. 17²⁰), and needed correction at that time.

9. Now it remains for us to survey the passages peculiar to the first Gospel which refer to the Kingdom as eschatological rather than imminent. Not the relation to the moment of utterance, but to the final drama appears to be the dominant interest of these singly attested allusions.

In the midst of the Sermon material we have in the transmitted text a combination of apparently irreconcilable elements. "Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." Then in the manner of a particularist apocalyptic the minutest detail of the written letter of the Law is said to persist "till all things be accomplished. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of the heavens: but whosoever shall do and teach (them), he shall be called great in the kingdom of the heavens. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness exceed (the righteousness) of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of the heavens" (5¹⁷⁻²⁰). These statements

would seem to be contradictory, and alien to the tenor of our Lord's general teaching on minute legal observance. If ¹⁹ be a saying of Jesus, its original reference must have been different from the present application ; but perhaps it would be better to regard it as one of the survivals within the circle of the first Gospel of that Jewish-Christian legalism which it was the work of St. Paul to combat and overcome. The "righteousness" of the strict or "separate" religious party among the Jews was just of this type, and yet the ensuing verse demonstrates in evidently genuine words that entrance to the Kingdom which is to be manifested demands a higher righteousness than theirs. The "kingdom" of ¹⁹ may well represent the community of Church-members of narrow outlook of an "Ebionite" character, who sought to graft the Gospel upon the Law.

The verse would then provide us with an example of the way in which this, the most ecclesiastical, Gospel preserves faithfully traces of the two divergent processes at work in primitive Christianity, the legalistic and the universalistic. The idea of the eternal Law appears in words similar to ¹⁸ in Luke (16¹⁷), but without any proper connexion. The thought of the Law's pre-existence and permanence was already prevalent, and persisted strongly in Jewish belief for centuries afterwards.

Indeed we are already upon the line of development which issues in the later doctrine that God Himself is occupied daily with the observance of legal regula-

tions. Even supposing ¹⁹ to be authentic in some other context, and to have reference either to its spiritual principles on the one hand or to the inconceivableness of any change by reason of the brevity of the interval on the other, the Kingdom in both records is that of the eschatological future: nor has the ethical utterance which follows (²⁰) any closer time-definition. The sole link between the verses seems to be the mention of the Kingdom, while ¹⁷ and ²⁰ are connected by the thought of a deeper fulfilment.

10. We come next to a portion of our Lord's teaching which deals with the necessity of practice as opposed to mere profession. It is Matthew alone who gives the utterance an eschatological colouring. After the enforcing of religious sincerity by the figure of the good tree which men recognise as such by its fruits, Jesus is represented as continuing: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of the heavens; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in the heavens" (^{7²¹}). Luke, in the same context of the discourse matter, has the more personal version of the saying: "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (^{6⁴⁰}); and this has primarily a present application. Both compilers close the Sermon material with the similitude of the builders on the rock and on the sand, dealing with a present likeness in character; but Matthew alone inserts a statement of the excuses which the unheeding will make to Jesus "in that day,"

evidently of final judgement ($\gamma^{22f.}$; cf. Lk 13²⁷), and that for Christians.

While a saying about the doer of the Father's will being fitted thereby to enter the Kingdom would be quite in harmony with the emphatic stress on practice traceable elsewhere in our Lord's teaching (*e.g.* 12⁵⁰, Lk 11^{27f.}), the present connexion in the first Gospel is clearly secondary and editorial (γ^{24} continues ²¹). The relating of the utterance to events of the end and specifically to the Judgement is peculiar to this evangelist. That the figure of the excluding of the careless and wrongdoers is ascribed to Jesus by the Lucan form of transmission in another context (13^{28f.}), does not compel us to regard the original saying relative to mere lip-religion as referring to the final consequences thereof. But the phrase, if authentic, is general, and affords in itself no basis of argument for the imminence of the Kingdom's arrival. The traditional connexion with prerogatives of exclusion exercised by the speaker will receive consideration in a subsequent section (p. 161 ff.).

II. The following references to the Kingdom, which are peculiar to Matthew, lead us to assume the influence of circumstances associated with Jewish-Christian communities, and of a specially eschatological bias, either in the compiler's religious views or in those of his circle.

In the interpretation which is provided for the parable of the Tares in the Matthean collection we

are told that the angels of the Son of man "shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity"; while, on the other hand, "the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (13^{41, 43}). There is no trace of language suggestive of a dual kingdom elsewhere in our Lord's reputed teaching—the sense is dissimilar in Lk 22^{29f.}; and that the present kingdom, presumably the Son's, has a mixed membership, while the future one, God's, is limited to the just among men, certainly renders it suspicious that the existing condition of the early congregations has affected the allegorical explanation which is here attributed to Jesus. Moreover, the thought of God as the Father of the righteous is not met with elsewhere in the Gospels. It seems imperative to ascribe the interpretation—which does not succeed the parable immediately—to a Jewish-Christian and purist section, for the language is thoroughly Judaistic.

Further, the preceding distinction between "the sons of the kingdom" and "the sons of the evil one" (13³⁸) can hardly be attributed in the given connexion to our Lord. For if "sons of the kingdom" might legitimately mean those fitted for the coming Kingdom, the general sense of the explanation implies that the sowing has already become the growth, the crop, members of the existing Church. We should not be far wrong in admitting that it would be unwise to seek to derive teaching with any claim to authenticity

concerning the Kingdom of God from this interpretation of a fundamentally genuine parable which will need further consideration below as illustrating a mystery of the Kingdom.

12. In the unique Matthean insertion concerning St. Peter, attached to the Confession episode, the following promise of authority is ascribed to Jesus: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of the heavens" (16¹⁹; cf. p. 66 f.).

Not so much the word "ecclesia," which might have a thoroughly Jewish significance, as the unparalleled tenor of this paragraph forbids us to deem it an authentic passage from our Lord's lips; yet in a growing cycle of Petrine stories it would be quite intelligible. That it is Jewish-Christian in origin admits also of no doubt. Only if we could interpret "the keys" of the message or teaching which opens the way into the Kingdom for those who accept it could we regard the expression as authentic; but it seems plain that in this context the Kingdom has become, or is in process of becoming, identified with the Church on earth. (For the figure of the keys, cf. 23¹³, Lk 11⁵², Apoc 1¹⁸; Slav En 42¹. Those of the Resurrection are delegated to Messiah, *bab Sanh* 113^a; those of the Gan 'Eden are in possession of the saints, and those of Hell in that of God, *ap. Wünsche, Aus Israels Lehrhallen*, iii. 54, 236.)

13. At the opening of the eighteenth chapter we find a small collection of sayings concerning "children"

and "little ones," which, taken in association with the similar passage in the same position in the Marcan narrative, exhibits inconsistent and interpretative elements.

Our Lord asks the disciples what had been the subject of discussion among themselves "in the way" (Mk 9^{33f.}), and they were ashamed to answer, because they had been disputing about their relative greatness, presumably in view of the Kingdom to which their hopes were directed and which they conceived in so realistic a fashion (cf. 10³⁷). So He called them to Him, and taught them that primacy was merited only by supreme service (³⁵).

If the originality of this verse be doubted here (om. from "and saith," D, etc.; cf. 10⁴⁴, Mt 23¹¹ etc.), the lesson is enforced just as well by the acted parable which follows. A child is set in the midst, and we expect the child-temper to be made their example: instead of which even in this Marcan tradition the child-type suddenly becomes the object of reception in Jesus' name, and the reception of "one of such children" implies the receiving of Jesus and of "him that sent" Him (³⁷). The latter part of this verse appears Mt 10⁴⁰, as if Mark here betrays an indirect acquaintance with loosely connected sayings in Q. We are thus led over in thought to the acceptance of childlike believers by the community of disciples, or to the friendly reception of the emissaries of the Gospel.

This confusion of two purposes for which the child is

represented as being used appears to have been anterior to the transmission of the narrative of this episode in Mark as we have it.

But the interchange of primary and derivative meanings is even more manifest in the first Gospel (18¹⁻⁵). As we should expect from our author's normal shielding of the apostles from blame, there is no hint here of the dispute; but a direct question takes its place, immediately after the Petrine story peculiar to this evangelist concerning our Lord's payment of the Temple tax. "Who then," they asked, "is greater in the kingdom of the heavens?" The child in the midst is forthwith used, as we expected in Mark, for a type of the disposition befitting the Kingdom: "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of the heavens" (1^{ff.}). This exactly suits the situation created by the disputing of the disciples, which the opening verse suppresses and replaces. In Mark (10¹⁵) the saying was attached to the blessing of the children in a more individual form (cf. p. 42); and Mt. does not repeat it in that place (19¹⁴). We may reasonably infer that the original tradition behind both recensions contained a reference to the well-known Kingdom that was to be, and that our Lord by way of rebuke revealed by act and word the disposition which was requisite therefor.

The next verse (4) confirms this. "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greater in the kingdom of the heavens." Then we

pass suddenly, as in Mk., to the reception of childlike converts or else of missionaries representing Christ, only coupled in this case with an additional warning (⁶, cf. Lk 17²) of the dire fate awaiting any who cause "one of these little ones who believe in me" to stumble, as if implying lowly believers who were apt to be despised by members of the religious society. The word "scandalise" forms the point of contact with the ensuing group of sayings on "offences" to others and to oneself (^{7ff.}), which we possess in fuller transmission in Mark, whose intervening episode of the exorcist forbidden by John and justified by the Lord (9^{38ff.}) is not recorded here. In the Marcan collection we found that "the kingdom of God" and "life" were interchangeable terms (p. 41). After this insertion Mt. returns to another utterance about the "little ones," this time the literal meaning being obviously the original one (¹⁰).

Despite the complexity which this material exhibits, the fact remains that the realisation of the Kingdom, and so the entering therein, lies in the future, but the present is the period for the display of the required characteristics of simplicity, trust and purity.

14. Associated with this conception of entering the Kingdom is a peculiar saying later in the Gospel, reported as having been uttered to self-righteous representatives of current orthodoxy. "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you" (21^{31b}), that is, because they at least have grasped the essential condition of

repentance. At first sight the Kingdom would seem to be a present sphere to be entered, but in their existing disposition those addressed were unfit for it. "Before you" must not be pressed literally; it only emphasises the fact that the outcasts have appreciated their need and have gladly received and acted on the message. There can be little doubt that the future is vividly pictured by our Lord to express the urgency of the required change in those to whom He is speaking. The spirit of the entrant can be exhibited now, but the entering itself can but be ideally present. "Kingdom of *God*" must be due either to the source utilised, or else to some early scribe who was more familiar with this form. There appears to be no point in the change, but the teaching is that the prime aim of the truly religious life is to be sure of "going in" when the Kingdom appears.

15. A final reference to the Kingdom as an eschatological objective is contained in that description of the pronouncement of sentence by "the king," according to the transmitted form, which serves as the conclusion to Matthew's last group of parables. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (25³⁴). Here the Kingdom, future, indeed in manifestation, is regarded (like the Messiah was, cf. En 48^{2f}, Ap Ezra 13²⁶) as pre-existent but still hidden.

Under such limitation of meaning a present sense might always be defended; but otherwise it is a strik-

ing fact that all the references peculiar to this Gospel express or imply the entering of the Kingdom of God in the undefined future. We hardly dare say, however, that the existence of the Christian communities and the consequent influence of Church experience have had no effect on the emphasising of the act of entrance in words which are attributed to Jesus, and are also applicable to the Church.

When we remember that except in the passages relative to proclaiming its nearness the peculiarly Lucan references implying the immediate proximity of the Kingdom were but two—one disputed, and the other not from Jesus, and that greater indefiniteness marks his eschatological allusions which are derived from the second common source; we are led to realise that the difference of environment, standpoint and aim has considerably affected the mode of transmission in this respect at least, and that it is Matthew who has the apocalyptic and eschatological tendency by far the most developed. We should not be untrue, therefore, in designating the Kingdom according to the two oldest reports of our Lord's own teaching as being imminent with regard to time (Mk.), but relatively indefinite with regard to description (Q).

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM OF GOD (*continued*)

C. THE KINGDOM POTENTIALLY PRESENT

IT is incumbent upon us now to investigate those passages in which the Kingdom seems to be treated as a present embodiment of divine dominion here on earth.

1. First we find it to be thought of by our Lord as ideally present in the actual manifestation of an earnest of its future power and greatness. Signs of the ruin of Satan's kingdom—belief in the existence of which, although comparatively recent among the Jews, Jesus under the limitations of His time naturally shared—were in themselves signs also of the in-breaking of the divine rule. "How can Satan cast out Satan? and if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand" (Mk 3²⁴, cf. Mt 12²⁵, Lk 11^{17f.} "how can his kingdom stand?"). This argument, used against His opponents, leads us to infer that Jesus considered the cure of cases of "possession" especially as due to His own (and His disciples') ability to utilise advance force, as it were, of the divine powers belonging to the coming Kingdom. Some such assurance seems to lie behind the strange ejaculation: "I beheld (impf.)

Satan as lightning fallen (aor.) from heaven" (Lk 10¹⁸), after the joyful announcement by "the seventy" upon their return of their success as exorcists. So in the immediately ensuing verses it is demonstrated that the closeness of the Kingdom is recognisable—for those who do not wilfully refuse to appreciate the beneficent acts—in the very deeds of exorcism which He has been practising in their midst, and that on the admission of the opponents themselves with remarkable and widely acclaimed effectiveness. "But if I with the finger (Mt. spirit) of God cast out demons, then is come upon you (ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) the kingdom of God" (Lk 11²⁰, Mt 12²⁸). Both records have "God" here, whether from the common source or by assimilation on the part of a copyist we cannot tell certainly. When the Church came to be identified with the Kingdom in an incomplete earthly stage, it was an easy step to apply a saying such as the above to its own practices of healing, conscious that to some extent the Kingdom had indeed already "come with power." But in the original circumstances such cures were tokens for all who were not wilfully obtuse of the certainty of the approach of the golden age of physical well-being and the triumph of goodness. This reference could as well be classed with those which suggest the immediate proximity of the manifestation of the reign of God.

2. These effective tokens of the Kingdom's advent recall the verbally reticent and non-committal reply of our Lord to the Baptist's Messianic question (Mt 11³,

Lk 7¹⁹). Visible and acknowledged facts are appealed to in order to supply the answer, for Jesus refrains from any open affirmative response. Yet we may have to admit some conscious art on the side of the compilers in bringing forward examples of the various prophesied tokens of Messiahship previous to this episode (*e.g.* Mt 10^{5ff.}, Lk 7^{11ff.}). But it is a noteworthy fact that nothing is said about the future in the reply, nor about any eschatological functions of the Messiah. Such may not have been called for, but the primitive and relatively less defined outlook seems to be characteristic of the underlying common source. In this connexion we return to a reference concerning John which appears more precise, to that hard passage in the testimony of our Lord to the Baptist (Mt 11¹¹, Lk 7²⁸; cf. p. 45 ff.), because many count it as evidence that the Kingdom was at that time present on earth, as if the greater than John were the member of an already established holy community which must at that stage of His ministry have consisted of the adherents of Jesus.

If so, the appended saying in Matthew would be taken as meaning, from the days of John to the moment of utterance the Kingdom of the heavens is already being forced, and forciers seize hold thereof (¹²). The Lucan turn given to the same utterance seems to be derivative; the Kingdom is evangelised and every one is now forced into it (16¹⁶). But a present eager rush of zealous men to storm the Kingdom and possess it is scarcely in harmony with the general trend of our

Lord's teaching, nor, on the other hand, is it at all consonant with His encouragement of singleness of aim to suppose Him to have spoken with sarcasm of zealous efforts that were misguided; and the contexts exhibit no politico-national colouring. The zeal, however, which found its exercise in readiness and in active proclamation on the part of His followers might quicken the people's conscience and thereby hasten the divine manifestation; but this is not a certain inference. Luke's reinterpreting of sayings which he apparently found considerably separated suggests in this case a present rush of converts into an existing community, which is not an unnatural explanation of the utterance to be current at a time when the Church was felt to be the Kingdom in becoming. The point of contact originally must have been discoverable in the attitude of men since John's warning cry, and so far this was assuredly present in the time of Jesus' own ministry.

3. According to an interpretative application inserted into the teaching of the closing days, we might suppose that the Kingdom already belonged to the Jews; and, ideally, theirs was indeed the kingdom of the saints of the Most High (Dn 7¹⁸). Jesus is represented as saying: "The kingdom of God shall be taken violently away from you (the Jews) and given to a nation (*ἐθνὴς*) doing its fruits" (Mt 21⁴³). This obviously interprets the preceding conclusion (⁴¹) to the parable of the "Wicked Husbandmen," and is not connected with the quotation about the corner-stone which follows (cf. Lk 20^{17f.}).

Even if our Lord were not quite convinced that He would shortly meet with a violent death—and the conviction is manifest in the story, unless it has suffered augmentation in transmission (cf. 26¹²)—we may suppose the events of the Passion and of A.D. 70 to have affected the interpretative use thereof. The explanatory addition is most easily accounted for if the Church had already become dominantly Gentile. The spiritually receptive among the Jews do not form a strong enough contrast to account for *ἐθνεα*, nor does the verse agree with that Judaising element which constitutes a marked factor in the Matthean tradition. The double statement seems best explained as a later interpretation of "other husbandmen" (⁴¹), and so must not be regarded as adding to our knowledge of the teaching of Jesus.

4. One other mention of the Kingdom in the first Gospel claims attention as appearing to indicate its present existence on earth. In the collection of denunciatory sayings—based doubtless on Q—our Lord is represented as urging service and humility as affording a more valid claim to real greatness than the acceptance of titles of human honour like "Rabbi" and "Teacher" (23^{11f.}), and then as adding a series of seven "Woes," the first of which runs: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye shut the kingdom of the heavens in front of men; for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them-that-are-entering-in to enter" (¹³). This idea of human hindrance finds expression in another context in Luke,

where the "lawyers" are denounced: "for ye took away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered" (11⁵²). Another hint of the correct interpretation is supplied by a "Gospel" fragment: "The key of the kingdom they hid" (Grenfell and Hunt, *New Sayings*). It may be noted that the saying about humility which immediately precedes the verse under discussion appears in Luke, embedded in the group of utterances associated with a Sabbath meal (14¹¹), and also at the close of the story of the Pharisee and the publican (18¹⁴).

There need be no hesitation in regarding the Matthean combination of the illustrative woes as secondary and editorial; and the prevalence of phrases connected with the idea of entering the Kingdom in this Gospel will be recalled. These varied indications suggest that we should regard the Kingdom in the usual way as eschatologically conceived, assuming the figure to have been used in an authentic saying: the point then being, that by discouraging the acceptance of the transforming doctrine of Jesus they prevented men from gaining those characteristics following on penitence which should fit them for the coming age. In a word, not the Kingdom itself, but the fitness therefor is really the present possibility. Indirectly, however, it is quite conceivable that our Lord regarded the scribes' opposition as hindering the divine manifestation. The saying would gain point, and perhaps suffer some change of form, when the Jewish hindrance of Christian propaganda became

acute; and the contrast with Christian authority for and encouragement of admission into that stage of the Kingdom's manifestation existing at the time of the composition of the Gospels—the Church on earth—would be enhanced (cf. 16¹⁹, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of the heavens," also Gr Ap Bar 11).

5. We proceed to interrogate the third Gospel, to see if it provides any stronger testimony to make us postulate the actually present existence of the Kingdom at the time of our Lord's preaching.

In Luke alone there is that unique passage in answer to the question of the Pharisees (17²¹), which apparently justifies the assumption of a present kingdom, already existent yet unseen, internal, in the hearts of men. But we discovered (p. 35) that the apocalyptic context—unless it were entirely inaccurate—demanded a future, sudden and universal manifestation, and that the disciples showed no signs of having understood our Lord to have spoken of a present spiritual state as being synonymous with the Kingdom of God, whatever the Pauline (*e.g.* Ro 8¹⁴ 14¹⁷), or, indeed, the evangelist's conception may have been; but as a fact the latter himself bears striking witness to the contrary (24²¹, Ac 1⁶). It would hardly be too much to say that the whole argument for an already existing kingdom rests in this instance on the purposeful and correct use in translation of transmission of a single word (*ἐντός*).

Perhaps we ought to remark that such a passage as the wedding similitude in the Marcan tradition (2^{19f.}),

where Jesus applies the title "bridegroom" to Himself, would seem to imply the presence on earth of the Messiah as such, and so of the Kingdom. But that assumes that the chronological position and the verbal form of the report are alike reliable. The thought of "the sons of the bridechamber" fasting because of the violent snatching away of the bridegroom (cf. Ap Ez 10¹⁻⁴) would have been unintelligible to the questioners, especially at the very early period of the ministry in which the episode is set. That something entirely new is present in the world is clearly evidenced by the context; but it is new teaching, and that preparatory for the Kingdom, an earnest it may be thereof, but not the reality. This is confirmed by the similes of the new cloth and new wine which follow the marriage figure.

Furthermore, there exists another group of allusions to the Kingdom of God in those parables in which a time of growth, a transition period whose length is not in the hands of man, is essential to the teaching which they convey. This has been widely thought to point to a kingdom already existent in the world and developing. But when we question these parables, assuming the general trustworthiness of their transmission, despite modifications inseparable from constant oral use even before the discourse-source was written, we find that the inference is in no case a necessary one, nor indeed is it the most suitable.

Take, for instance, the story of the Seed growing

secretly (Mk 4^{26ff.}), which may, like that of the Tares, be either a divergent form or a different recension of one root-parable, or may simply be one of the same family-type of similitude. Is the growing the point of the story, and not rather the lapse of a period inexactly defined as from sowing to harvest? But the development and the time of ripening are alike God's, and not man's care.

The *tertium comparationis* appears to be God's waiting when the seed of existing conditions has been sown, and the lapse of time, like the corn's growth in the earth, is "automatic." Is not this to teach that proclamation and self-preparation are the urgent duties of the adherents of Jesus, but that the time of the Kingdom's in-breaking upon the world is still future, and the reaping at the end of the age is in God's hands? Thus the Kingdom can only be said to be present in germ through the message, and potentially and ideally present in the transformed experience of the recipients thereof. That the preparatory announcement hardly bears comparison with the glorious reality, when manifested, is shown in the brief similitudes of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven (Mk 4³⁰, Mt 13^{31, 33}, Lk 13^{18, 20}): the result is out of all proportion to the apparently insignificant beginning.

In these last parables, undue stress may have been laid in the customary exegesis on the distinction between extensive and intensive growth—in the world and in the heart. The time is only relative, and

different in each case ; but a period of interval and of, as it were, spontaneous activity is the common feature. The issue would appear to denote the manifestation of the Kingdom from the divine side, the coming "in power"; for which the earthly preparation, although essential, viewed from the standpoint of the future realisation, seems so inadequate—the present work of Jesus, and the ministration of a few faithful disciples.

Now, it will be found that the same implication holds good of the fuller parable of the Sower, and the more allegorical form of the Tares. A period of interval, length unknown, must elapse during which men can fit themselves by acceptance of the initial proclamation of the proximity of the Kingdom, and then watchfully wait: yet the end is not dimly remote, for it is sure as nature's processes. The growth of an already existent kingdom, concretely manifest though unrecognised in the world, would have been a conception not only anachronistic, but unintelligible to the hearers of our Lord's stories ; and the evolution of the Christian communities through many a century is a modern explanation utterly foreign to the original thought of the parables, and beyond the horizon of the audience, if not indeed of the humanly conditioned creator of these word-pictures so beautiful, so straightforward for the perceptive, and so universal in their effective teaching.

To sum up with the utmost brevity. It would seem true to state that in the earliest reports of our Lord's utterances there is no single certain reference to an

actually present Kingdom of God. If there be no existing earthly embodiment, all that can be said is that an earnest of its power is recognised in the acts of Jesus which are regarded by Him as overthrowing Satanic influence, and thus an assurance of the final ruin of the kingdom of evil.

Moreover, it can be regarded as germinally, potentially or ideally present by reason of its proclamation and the results thereof in transfigured lives ; yet this is a barely visible and meagre commencement, a merely personal foretaste of the glory and blessedness that the realisation will bring. Every reference commonly taken as applicable to an existing dominion, in fact rather than in idea, whether in Luke or in Matthew, would appear to be interpreted more harmoniously with the general teaching by being applied to a divine Kingdom which is yet to be revealed from heaven amongst men.

The Kingdom is indeed said to be ideally possessed by "the poor in spirit" (Lk., the actually poor) in the first Beatitude (Mt 5³, Lk 6²⁰), and by those that "have been persecuted" (if this form can be regarded as authentic, Mt 5¹⁰); but such references may better be included among those which deal with the ethical characteristics which mark those fitted for citizenship (p. 84). Blessedness in the reign of God will also be the lot of those who are not "caused to stumble" by the humble guise on earth of the Messiah whose full glory as the heavenly Son of man is still future, as our Lord intimated at the close of His reply to the Baptist's question (Mt 11⁶).

Yet this blessedness is felt in the present by the loyal adherents, who see the tokens of the Messianic age already about them (Mt 13^{16f.}, Lk 10^{23f.}). Not only encouragement accrues from this experience, but also a foretaste of the Kingdom's joy, if we regard the fundamental thought expressed in terms which probably reflects later conflicts (Mt 5¹², Lk 6²³), and the happiness which would inevitably arise from their hopes to pervade their present devoted service (Mt 24⁴⁶ 25²¹). But in all these cases the felicity which is present is potential, ideal and personal,—a subjective condition rather than an objective realisation.

D. THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM

There is every reason to believe that our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom of God was based on current conceptions and popular hopes. But that He spiritualised and transformed the political and national expectations and laid the chief stress on personal and ethical preparation is also obvious. It is then at least probable that the transmuting of the contemporary views would be discernible alike in the public teaching and in such traces as we have of the private training of His disciples.

That which was new would be introduced in that indirect form of instruction by stories which Jesus made peculiarly His own; for the open declaration of novel ideas on matters dear to the patriotic and exclusive

nature of the Jewish people would only arouse fanatical opposition and hinder their acceptance.

It is natural to assume that answers would be given to the inquiries of His intimates on the subject of His discourses to the crowds; but they could not be expected to be prominent in records which themselves reflected the public preaching of apostles and apostolic men. It is not surprising, then, that but little of what may be termed esoteric instruction is to be found in the Gospel-narratives; yet this fact gives us no right to reject such indications as are discoverable, and to suppose them to be of later insertion. Those having "ears to hear" would detect the underlying teaching which was contrary to or invalidated current opinions of the nature of the Kingdom of God, and explanation in private would assuredly be sought. This is not to claim that the exact form in which we have indication thereof is absolutely reliable; but for those who were in their turn to teach others instruction in the doctrine which was new was undoubtedly necessary. That what had to be published abroad included the revealing of something hitherto ungrasped is evident from the term "mystery" (mysteries, Mt., Lk.) which the synoptic records apply to it.

They all narrate the inquiry of the disciples for further information after the parable of the Sower, and the reason for acceding to the request.

"To you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but to those without all things are done (*γίνονται*)

in parables," with a result of non-understanding such as Isaiah expressed (Mk 4^{11f.}). Luke has a condensed form: "to you is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to the rest in parables, that seeing they may not see and hearing they may not understand" (8¹⁰). Matthew, on the contrary, expands considerably: "to you . . . of the heavens, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, etc. Wherefore I talk unto them in parables, because seeing they see not and hearing they hear not nor understand: and there is fulfilled in them the prophecy of Isaiah" (6^{9f.} being quoted fully from the LXX version); and he supplies the additional comment on the blessedness of the disciples' experience of tokens of the approaching Kingdom (13¹¹⁻¹⁷; cf. above, p. 72).

Our Lord's acquaintance with the varying receptiveness of His hearers is reflected not only in this first reported parable, but in other "mixture" parables of the Kingdom, and it would hardly be an exaggeration to detect a touch of pathos in the verification of the prophet's words in His own experience. But the whole tenor of the ministry as we have it recorded forbids us to interpret this diversely transmitted hint as to the parabolic method of Jesus in any way which should suggest intentional misleading of His audience. Only teaching by story was as a fact indirect and relatively cryptic, and demanded attention to grasp the lesson therein conveyed: such elucidation as would avail for the faithful ones would be unsuitable for public

proclamation then or "in His name"; commendation of the message must precede transformation of the hearer thereby.

Difficult as it may be for us to learn in plain terms what were the hidden things concerning the Kingdom which had to be gradually made known, we can realise to a large extent what they were by questioning the purport of the indirect teaching which revealed them to the intelligent and thoughtful listener. Nor could the method, humanly speaking, have been otherwise; else the new wine had burst the old skins, and an early opposition would have been aroused, which would have effectually prevented the acceptance of the proclamation. That the intimation afforded by these passages offered as time went on opportunities for the invention of a large amount of esoteric doctrine, Gnostic and otherwise, can hardly be gainsaid; but elaboration in private must have been supplied, if only for the sake of those who had to carry the message further, and bring out in their teaching "things new and old" (Mt 13⁵²), because His mission and theirs was to make manifest what was hidden (Mk 4²², Lk 8¹⁷; cf. Mt 10^{26f.}, Lk 12^{2f.}). All these things are indirect traces, yet they constitute cumulative evidence of a historic fact behind the term "mystery"—the opening of the mind of the Master to the inquiring intimates; and this private instruction would fall into the background or be lost sight of when the Person of the Teacher, the returning Lord as the bringer of the Kingdom, became central in the Church's Gospel. A

change in the stimulus to inward transformation of the hearers was inevitable after the events of the Passion and the Resurrection. We need not then be perturbed by the doubtfulness relative to the *ipsissima verba* which arises out of the modifications inseparable from much repetition; nor are we required to think it likely that οἱ ἑξῶ in the present instance represents exactly the way in which Jesus spoke of those who listened but indifferently and failed to grasp the essential newness of His doctrine (Mk 4¹¹; cf. 1 Th 4¹²). The parabolic method is an established factor in our Lord's ministry; it would impel questioning in earnest disciples, and there is no reason to think that their inquiries went unsatisfied. If Christians came to assume that Jesus used the method in order to hide the truth from all but the few, we feel instinctively that they were mistaken, and that any such intention was utterly alien to His own conception of His mission. The method was to lead to the new and deeper teaching, to the transforming of the idea of the Kingdom; to reveal, not to conceal.

The parables of "likeness" will throw light on that which the stories were to convey concerning the membership of the coming Kingdom, although we may well admit that the introductory formulæ, owing to separate retelling, displacements, and the like, are not entirely reliable as they stand: some may have been editorially attached, some may have been lost. But we cannot fail to gain some illumination from a brief review of those parables which are thus directly related by the

evangelists to the new teaching about the Kingdom for which the Jews were anxiously expectant.

1. First we have parables of "likeness" which demonstrate that although the advent of the Kingdom may be, as was popularly conceived, catastrophic, yet there is a period of time, a transition interval, brief it may be, but of unknown length, during which *development*, preparation and growth go on. Men have to be, as it were, ripe for it; it has also to be mature for its appearance from heaven in God's time.

According to the transmission which we possess, the brief similitude of the Mustard-seed would appear to belong to both main sources (Mk 4³⁰, Mt 13³¹, Lk 13¹⁸), possibly reaching Mark indirectly from Q, and that of the Leaven certainly was contained in Q (Mt 13³³, Lk 13²⁰). In both cases there is the endeavour to find an illustration from common things, something "like"; but what is the point of comparison? Evidently, as we have already noticed at the close of the previous section, littleness succeeded after a period long or short according to the nature of the case by disproportionate greatness. The magnitude of the Kingdom when manifested will make the preparatory symptoms of its early proclamation by John and by Jesus seem infinitesimally small. But the things compared do not tell the extent of the period of transition, simply the organic relation between the two, as of seed to full development, as of the leaven particles to the transformed bread, is emphasised. Only

in this ideal and prophetic fashion could we find it justifiable to regard the Kingdom as present on earth during our Lord's ministry. To Him the end is contained germinally, as it were, in the existing condition of things.

There is, however, as we saw, in the Marcan tradition a parable preceding that of the mustard, concerning the Secret Growth of the seed (4²⁶⁻²⁹), beginning: "So is the kingdom of God," and teaching the same lesson of a lapse of time which would fit the needful and automatic development from the sowing which was regarded as already accomplished, through the period until the maturity which is befitting to the harvest looked upon as a divine work. Jesus preaches; God brings the Kingdom in His time.

2. That in this period of preparation men are not alike, indeed that there is considerable diversity of type, is shown in a series of stories whose point of comparison is *mixture*. It has, however, to be noted that these belong to the Matthean record only, and they may in their interpretation have been influenced by eschatological interest and ecclesiastical bias in a way that the original form did not justify. Nevertheless, the type would appear to be guaranteed as authentic by the prime example of the parables in the synoptic narratives, that of the Sower, which describes from experience the diverse receptiveness and fruitfulness of different classes of hearers in view of the advent of the reign of God; only an introductory formula relating this story directly to the Kingdom is wanting.

The "mixture" parables refer strictly not to the Kingdom in its full manifestation, but to the undefined and unknown interval between proclamation and consummation. Thus we have the commingling of wheat and darnel between sowing and harvest-time (Mt 13^{24ff.}), and the normal mingling of edible and inedible kinds in a catch of fish (13⁴⁷).

But that the mixture is one of men is more distinctly portrayed in the stories about human types which this same Gospel hands down; during the lapse of time between command and recompense, invitation and repast, announcement and fulfilment. This is illustrated by the parable of the Labourers in the vineyard (20^{1ff.}), in which the special emphasis is on the one reward, the Kingdom, although the hours that have passed for them respectively between call and reckoning might be disproportionate according to men's standard, and one sincerity of service is assumed for all.

Again, even the most despised and unconsidered strata of human society, as they were represented in the days and in the country of Jesus, have the divine invitation for admission to the banquet of the Kingdom, as the Supper parable demonstrates (Mt 22^{2ff.}, Lk 14^{16ff.}); although Matthew presents complex material which obscures the original story, and the Lucan form possesses no introductory "likeness" formula. Whether the disabilities of the classes mentioned were intended in the first instance to refer to the heathen may be doubted, and only Luke has the mission to "the high-

ways and hedges" outside (^{22f.}); but when the Church became preponderatingly Gentile the application if secondary was sufficiently obvious.

In a similar manner the time which will elapse before the appearing of the Kingdom is like that between a householder's departure and his return after an unknown interval, during which different offices are expected to be exercised and fulfilled with constant fidelity and devoted service. This is shown in the two stories—whatever may have been the exact original or originals, and whatever the special applications with which the compilers were familiar—of the Talents (Mt 25^{14ff.}), and the Pounds (Lk 19^{12ff.}); the latter of which is related, at least in the written transmission, to an inquiry as to the immediacy of the manifestation of the Kingdom of God, while the former is given at the close a definitely eschatological turn. Thus we realise that men waiting for the divine salvation are of different types and classes, with diverse capabilities and functions; but for all the one thing certain is the uncertainty of the duration of their activities in personal service after response to the divine summons in penitence, trust and devotion. This undefined transition-interval thus forms a link of connexion between the teaching of the "development" and of the "mixture" stories.

3. Another point of likeness between the Kingdom and conditions obtaining on earth lies in the supreme *value* of it as an object of search or acquisition from the

standpoint of the individual, something to be attained at all costs. This is brought out especially by a couple of similitudes peculiar to Matthew's chapter of parables of the Kingdom.

"The kingdom of the heavens is like treasure hid in the field," to obtain which a man sells all that he has (13⁴⁴). "Again, the kingdom of the heavens is like a merchant seeking beautiful pearls," who sells all to secure the one pearl "of great price" (45^t). It will be noted that into these little stories drawn from life the time-conception does not enter; but the stress lies entirely on the immense importance of the objective which is worth the greatest effort to obtain, even if it should require the sacrifice of all one's possessions.

From these examples it may easily be appreciated how each group or type of parables brings out some mark in the new teaching about the Kingdom, one of the "mysteries" or secrets before unrealised in regard of the attitude of earnest individuals, the sincere religious minority, thereto. And this attitude relates—in the first instance at least—to the period, whose duration is known to the Father alone, before its sudden and world-wide arrival. At that time the seeking of admission will be, as the recurring simile of the closed door indicates (Lk 13^{24ff.} etc.), too late.

4. Once more, we may find the "likeness" to consist in the characteristic *quality* exhibited by the actor or actors in our Lord's stories; this same quality being required in the would-be members of the Kingdom.

Such will have to be considered with more detail in the next section among the ethical conditions inseparable from acceptance within the holy community of the future. In relation to others, there is the forgiving disposition which the king in the story displays, and which is incumbent upon all who would serve the heavenly King (Mt 18^{23ff.}); and the ministering love which finds expression in mutual service (25^{35ff.}). In relation to the individual, there is the readiness for the breaking forth of the heavenly rule in visible power upon earth; typified corporately and singly by the "wise" virgins (25^{1ff.}), by the "faithful" slaves in the Talents and Pounds type of parable, and taught on the negative side by the warning to be derived from the pitiable plight of the rejected, whether "foolish" maidens or excluded guests whose indifference to the summons was culpable (Mt 22^{11f.}, Lk 14²⁴ etc.).

E. THE QUALITIES ESSENTIAL FOR MEMBERSHIP

We have realised so far that there are very good grounds—to say the least—for regarding the Kingdom of God as preached by Jesus and as understood in the primitive tradition to be the divine dominion concretely conceived, and predominantly if not wholly future, the potencies at work in healing and exorcism being foretastes of its power, signs of its imminent approach. Apart from the proclamation of its nearness, we discovered that many references to it taught that its advent was to be expected within a few years, while

others indicated its incidence as bound up with the anticipated eschatological events without any closer time-definition.

Bearing this in mind we turn to the numerous passages which demand some personal quality as imperative for admission to the Kingdom when it is established. Because of the newness of their teaching, they are associated with, and by means of one or two representative examples have been just included in, the section above concerning the Mystery of the Kingdom, but because of their range they require separate treatment. Let us now review them.

(a) Perhaps the first personal quality of which we think in this connexion is *childlikeness*. As realised in the Master's mind when the little ones were brought to Him: "of such is the kingdom of God." "Unless ye receive it"—strictly the message concerning it—"like a child, ye shall not enter therein" (Mk 10^{14f.}, Lk 18^{16f.}, Mt 19¹⁴), and in the fuller Matthean form: "unless ye turn and become as little children, ye shall not enter" (18³).

Now the verse which follows here, and the dispute which Mark reports, clearly indicate lowliness to be one part of the requisite character (cf. Mt 11²⁹ 19³⁰ 23¹² etc.), but still more marked qualities are unpretending simplicity and affectionate trust. Such did not need to be specially designated in detail to child-cherishing Jews: the demand for the quality was sufficiently arresting and transforming of itself.

(b) If the frank and trustful simplicity of the child was an essential unexpected by the religious orthodoxy of observance, still more so was that *poverty* rather than riches which was declared to be a happy state, because assisting instead of hindering the development of qualities which fitted men for admission to the coming Kingdom: so much so, that to the poor it belonged ideally even now (p. 71). Common to all the Synoptists is the exclamation of Jesus after the departure of the rich questioner: "how hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God"; followed by the proverbial comparison of the camel, in response to the surprise expressed by the disciples (Mk 10^{23ff.}, Mt 19^{23f.}, Lk 18^{24f.}). Wealth, with its comfort, self-satisfaction and contentment with present conditions, was seen by our Lord to be a serious hindrance to that self-transforming effort which was necessary to fit a man for admission to the coming Kingdom. Poverty, on the other hand, regarded usually as betokening divine disfavour for sins which might yet be unknown to the oppressed and impoverished themselves, is deemed a blessed condition. Such, humbled and penitent, without worldly encumbrances, our Lord realises in prophetic assurance are possessors of the Kingdom which is to be. Doubtless the really poor (Lk 6²⁰) as well as those of a similar lowly temperament (Mt 5³) were singled out in the first instance by Jesus as "happy." This was another startling transformation of values in view of the approaching Kingdom.

(c) Another striking feature is the emphasis on *effort* to promote personal fitness: seeking, striving, singleness of aim characterise the candidate for acceptance in the coming age. Inclusion in the Kingdom must be life's chief aim: "Seek ye first (Mt.) His kingdom (*sc.* the Father's), and His righteousness" (Mt.); to such earnest seekers, though few, the Father's bestowal is assured, according to Luke (12^{31ff.}; cf. Mt 6³³), so that effort after worldly treasure is of little worth. This declaration of the urgency of seeking bears originality on the face of it, but the Lucan appendage of encouragement may be later, as it scarcely harmonises with the Sermon material, nor does the ensuing verse in Matthew appear to have any original connexion.

Although the Kingdom is not directly named, yet the context in Luke's arrangement concerning salvation and exclusion demonstrates that it is the objective implied in our Lord's exhortation: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate" (13²⁴). The period in which to fit oneself for admission is brief in any circumstances; the greatest earnestness of effort is desirable in order to be received within. We may well link with this the need of complete devotion to the cause of the Kingdom, whether the emphasis be on self-preparation or on the proclamation of its advent to others. There is, for instance, the illustration from the man who requires all his attention to plough a straight furrow on the rough surface (Lk 9⁶²); and to the questioner who displayed the spirit if not the ready self-sacrifice

of a would-be member of the ideal community our Lord awarded the commendation: "Thou art not far from" the possession of the requisite qualities for "the kingdom of God" (Mk 12³⁴).

(d) But again and again we are made to realise that no mere observances will fit for admission, and yet in correspondence with the Father's will there must be human practice, the new or *higher righteousness*, which is far above ritual and profession. Not even the plea of the closest intimacy will avail to gain special favour in the Messianic dominion, but only active ministry, even the menial offices of a slave, leads to true greatness therein: selflessness vanquishes selfishness (Mk 10^{37ff.} ||), and in this self-offering for others the Master is the supreme example (⁴⁵, Mt 20²⁸).

Not the one who acclaims Jesus "Lord!" shall enter, but the doer of the divine will (Mt 7²¹); only he who puts into practical exercise the message which he has heard has built surely for himself a habitation in the age to come (^{24f.}), and for those toilers of extremest self-denial who have quitted all that the world holds dearest the Kingdom is assured (Mt 19¹²). But we are able to trace in more detail some phases of the practice of this new righteousness which Jesus taught as the due preparation for the Kingdom and for the judgement which its manifestation necessarily involved.

(1) First of all, the pre-requisite for any such conduct as the result of the proclamation which had been heard from Jesus and His emissaries is *understanding*. Al-

though the exact words may not be authentic here, the idea which frequently recurs may be expressed best in the terms of the Matthean warning: "Everyone hearing the word of the kingdom, and not understanding, the evil one cometh and seizeth that which is sown in his heart" (13¹⁹); the message once grasped must in bearing fruit transform the life, so that such as comprehend and submit whole-heartedly to the teaching become—in another Matthean phrase—"the good crop, the sons of the kingdom" (13³⁸; cf. 51^{f.}).

(2) The message of the Kingdom, however, when heard, understood and accepted, produces the first great change, *repentance*. This is an indelible feature, an inalienable condition, for the attainment of the required character, according to John and Jesus alike (Mt 3², Mk 1¹⁵ ||); and penitence is inseparable from faith in the tidings (and by implication in the messenger), whether the presence of that quality be named or not.

So was it with the hearers of the disciples (Mk 6¹²); so would it have been with the populace of familiar cities, had they only attended to the proclamation in their midst (Mt 11^{21ff.}); such was the case too with the despised classes of our Lord's day, who both heard and accepted in penitence and trust (21³¹). That repentance was essential also to the reception of the primitive apostolic preaching is confirmed by the words ascribed to the risen Lord at the close of the third Gospel: "that repentance should be preached in His name unto remission of sins unto all the nations" (24⁴⁷).

On the other hand, unfitness for the Kingdom is marked by absence of repentance and therefore of faith (cf. Mt 23²⁸), whether individual or collective. Thus even the restorative activity of Jesus was hindered "in his own country" (Mk 6⁵). So too lack of penitence involves "perishing" in some deeper sense than that experienced by those Galileans slain in the Temple *fracas*, or by the accident at Siloam (Lk 13^{1ff.}), which events are utilised as a stimulus to repentance, and the lesson is driven home by the parable of the barren Fig-tree (6^{ff.}). But the practice of penitence causes "joy in heaven" (15^{7. 10}, cf. 17. 24. 32); yet it has to be effected without "signs and wonders" (16^{30ff.}).

(3) For many, if not for all, the utmost *self-denial*, a self-sacrificing abandonment of home ties, is the prelude to the practice of the new righteousness. With this was associated personal following of the Prophet of Nazareth in the first instance, as the story of the Ruler tells us (Mk 10²¹ ||). Thus it was with the original apostles, whose ideas of future recompense were limited by national and material notions (Mk 10^{29f. 35ff.} ||). So even that whole-hearted renunciation which involves the single life was required from those who were capable of it, because of the fewness at first of the heralds of the new age (Mt 19¹²). Indeed, loyalty to the Master may involve the sacrifice of life itself (Mk 8³⁵ ||, Mt 16²⁵, Lk 17³³; cf. Lk.'s illustrative additions as to "counting the cost," 14^{28ff.}).

(4) That the religious life which ensues after

repentance and renunciation is no mere legal punctiliousness on the old lines is manifested by the strong statement, to which allusion has been made already: "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall not enter the kingdom of the heavens" (Mt 5²⁰); yet this was the norm of popularly-respected although not universally-practised orthodoxy.

Jesus, in proclaiming the Kingdom, demanded something loftier. But this higher righteousness involved *endurance*, the sharing in the Master's "temptations" (Lk 22²⁸), even the bitter experience of persecution, which the assurance of future possession sweetened; although the beatitude of the persecuted, "blessed are they that have suffered persecution for righteousness' sake" (5¹⁰), must be considered of doubtful genuineness in its present form. The righteous too, in the traditional explanation of the parable of the Tares, are something more than the old legalists (13⁴³), and as such are assured partakers of the resurrection (Lk 20³⁵).

(5) This righteousness consists not only in a specific individual attitude towards the coming Kingdom, it includes a new conception of the duty to one's neighbour, it has an *altruistic* side, for the Kingdom is the holy society of the accepted righteous. In order to have a share in the Kingdom certain duties to others are expressly taught, and these all spring from the root virtue of Love. This quality, apart from the fact that it is regarded as central in the religious life without any

specific mention of the Kingdom (Mk 12^{30ff.} 11), finds its effectual manifestation in the main, in two ways, with the new age definitely in view.

(a) *Forgiveness* is intimately connected with the prayer for the coming of the Kingdom of God. "Forgive us our debts (sins, Lk.), as we also have forgiven our debtors (forgive everyone that is indebted to us, Lk.)"; clearly teaching that human forgiveness of others is a pre-condition for the divine pardon of oneself (Mt 6¹², Lk 11⁴). And this is confirmed by a saying found in each of the main streams of tradition; at the close of an utterance on prayer and faith (linked at present with the story of the withered fig-tree): "When ye stand praying, forgive if ye have aught against any, that your Father also who is in the heavens may forgive your trespasses" (Mk 11²⁵); and again in the Sermon material, immediately following the Lord's Prayer: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Mt 6^{14f.}), alluding evidently to the individual divine judgement connected with the advent of the Kingdom.

Moreover, we may safely assume that the same relation of mercy towards one's fellows (Mt 18^{21f.}, Lk 17^{31f.}) is emphasised in the story of the Unforgiving Slave, since the loving disposition of the king is expected to be manifested by the subjects in their relations one toward another. This is consistently testified by our Lord's own example, both declaratory

and didactic (*e.g.* Mk 2⁵, Lk 7^{41ff.} etc.). Forgiveness is then a mark of the life fitted for the Kingdom (Mt 18^{23ff.}); indeed, failure to exhibit it signifies incapacity to receive it: "So also will my heavenly Father do unto you, if you from your hearts forgive not each one his brother" (35) is the pointing of the lesson of the parable, quite in harmony with the other teaching on the matter, albeit only preserved in single transmission. Passages which show that even worship without prior human reconciliation is unacceptable (*e.g.* Mt 5^{23f.}) only serve to bear out this stress on mercy as an essential characteristic of candidates for the Kingdom.

(*b*) But a more openly active feature of this love is its *ministering*, and that, like the divine love, must not be confined to fellow-strivers for admission, but must be all-embracing, including foes and persecutors in its scope: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may become sons of your Father who is in the heavens," etc. (Mt 5⁴⁴, Lk 6^{27ff.}; cf. 10^{30ff.}), and thus assuredly fit for membership in His Kingdom. Further, whatever may have been the original form of the vivid picture of mutual serving love portrayed in the Judgement scene which is described at the close of Matthew's last group of parables (25^{35ff.}; cf. for the setting, En 62; and for the details, Test Jos 1⁶), there is no reason to limit such manifestation of ministering love to born Jews or to the adherents of Jesus alone. Although it could not

apply at its first utterance either to the treatment of Christians by one another, or to the treatment of missionaries of the Gospel by the heathen, it enunciates a principle universal in its range, and essentially greater than any mere so-called "Interimsethik." Those who stoop to the humblest services for their fellows are exalted in the judgement of Heaven, and, if the figure is to be pressed, receive higher recognition in the coming Kingdom (Mk 9³⁵; cf. 10⁴⁰). So the first in estimate must be slave of all in humble ministration, after the example of Him whose service extends even to the relinquishing of life itself "on behalf of many" (10^{43ff.}), and is taught in act, according to the Fourth Gospel, by the menial episode of the washing of the feet of the apostles (Jn 13^{4ff.}).

Thus our study of the passages which relate to the Kingdom of God leads us to conclude that while the reign of God soon expected by Jesus would be manifested at a time and in a way known to the Father alone, it is man's part to fit himself for that divine advent by the realisation of an inward and moral sonship to God in response to the transforming message of Jesus, and, following Him in example and service, by the display Godward and manward of those characteristics demanded as essential for the subjects of the Kingdom whose entrance is in the last resort only rendered possible by royal grace, through the parental forgiveness of the penitent child of man by the divine Father-King.

CHAPTER III

THE SON OF MAN

THE glorious Kingdom of God of which the old theocracy was but a dim foreshadowing was the natural setting for the Jews' eager desires for divine justification. Despite the narrow prejudices which had limited the conception of it, and the materialising of those occasional outbursts of universalism with which seers had enlarged it, the hope of the Kingdom was the most valuable and the most cherished heritage of the people of Jesus. But more than this, we have realised already in some faint manner from the very fragmentary records how the contemplation thereof filled the Lord's earthly life, and the interpretation of it—which was the revelation of His divine Son-consciousness—directed and dominated His teaching; and beyond the shadow of death which crossed the foreground and made certain a way of suffering brief but dark He saw continually and in His humanity we may surmise with growing clearness the glistening vista of the reign of God, in which under transfigured earth-conditions He should rule the community of the faithful, the elect, the

remnant—to use the prophet's term, those worthy to share the Kingdom prepared for them.

The details of His vision of the future He never revealed in set terms, nor would His own intimates have apprehended them on their lower mental level. But in whatever thought-forms, conditioned and limited by His time and race, they may have been clothed, He evidently left the entire fulfilment of the consummation to the Father's will and pleasure in perfect filial confidence, save for the unassailable conviction that in the divine scheme His was a dominion which passed the bounds of any current political and national expectation of Messianic warrior- or teacher-king.

There is little need now to expend space in proving that in this Kingdom, whose coming constituted the controlling factor in His ministry, He knew Himself to be the Ruler, God's Vice-gerent on earth, or, in the hallowed term of His people, the Messiah.

The fact of Christianity itself in its earliest and simplest phase would seem to refute those few scholars of repute (*e.g.* Wellhausen, Schmidt, etc.) who deny the personal claim to be the figure of popular hope. The followers of Jesus felt assured that He was both Lord and Christ, because they were certain that the Resurrection appearances confirmed His claim to be such. Yet we are fully aware that not for a long period of the ministerial career did His closely associated and personally trained disciples attain, through Peter as the shrewdest spokesman of them, to this epoch-making

confession. We are fully aware also that if His foes at length understood only to reject the claims of His life, His friends were baffled by its contradiction of the cherished beliefs of their nation and upbringing. The most important problem is not in what mode or at what moment did His humanity conceive itself to have the Messianic vocation; but what sort of Messiah did He feel compelled to be, or was He conscious of becoming, "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" working in and through His unique Sonship-experience, which both friend and foe before the end understood Him to claim? Which of the many phases of the Messianic conception, prophetic and apocalyptic, ethical and eschatological, was He to fulfil? Should He work out one envisaged in days of triumph of old? Should He realise the vision of yearning hope, what time the nation's outlook had been clouded by disaster and depression? Was it the mysterious Danielic figure or the Suffering Servant of Isaiah's book, the heavenly being of the Similitudes of Enoch or the meek king of the roll of Zechariah, or again the conception of the Psalms of the Pharisees, that afforded the prototype for His Person and office? We might answer—All and yet no one of them alone.

The Messiah of His self-consciousness fulfilled in one personality all that was lofty and spiritual in fragmentary and partial foreshadowings and expressions.

Of the passages in the synoptic narratives which exhibit our Lord's teaching concerning Himself, those

which contain the title "the Son of man" may be expected to throw most light on this intricate problem. But the internal evidence of the text forbids our accepting them just as they have been transmitted by editors and copyists.

To their sifting and their understanding we must therefore address ourselves. We shall come to feel instinctively and with reasonable justice that this self-designation "the Son of man" cannot fairly be eliminated from the primitive tradition and attributed to the reflexion of the early Church. For the title, being capable of misapprehension among Hellenistic converts (owing to the apparent stress on son-relationship and human-ness), had to be relinquished as inadequate, and, as is well known, it is only applied to Jesus outside the Gospels in Ac 7⁵⁶, and probably so in Apoc 1¹³ 14¹⁴. Each of the oldest strata, however, Mark and Q, exhibits it, as we shall now see.

In order that we may obtain a complete survey we must set forth the reported utterances of our Lord which contain (in all or any of the Synoptic Gospels) the use of this title. We shall find it serviceable to classify them according as they deal with the foretelling of suffering (*A*) and of coming in majesty (*B*), and with the latter as illustrated by allusions to His "day" (*C*) and His judicial prerogatives (*D*). Further, we must review those references in which the self-designation is plainly a substitute for the first personal pronoun (*E*); but it will be readily understood that many occurrences

other than those included in this group possess a personal aspect. Besides, there are the ambiguous passages wherein the title seems to have a more general significance (*F*); and, finally, the recorded references of Jesus to Himself as "the Son" require notice so as to complete the picture of the conception of His Son-consciousness (*G*).

A. THE PREDICTIONS OF SUFFERING

When we approach the references in the synoptic tradition which exhibit the use of the title "Son of man" we must be careful to rid ourselves of all prepossessions and prejudices, as far as that is humanly possible, and just permit the sources to bear witness for themselves: for this inquiry they are our only sure basis. We interrogate the Marcan narrative first, as heretofore, and compare the parallel passages. Leaving aside the ambiguous instances in the second and third chapters for a while, let us review at the outset the recurring Passion programme, as we may call it, which, according to this evangelist whom the others follow, is revealed repeatedly by Jesus after that confession of His Messiahship by St. Peter which forms a dividing line in His ministerial career (Mk 8²⁹ ||).

1. The first announcement of suffering as necessary to the fulfilment of His office is represented as immediately succeeding this event, and the terms reported are deliberate and imply reiterated teaching to the same effect. "And he began to teach them that the Son

of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he kept speaking the saying openly" (Mk 8^{31f.}). The others agree in placing this new doctrine so subversive of inherited conceptions after the same occasion, only varying the mode of its introduction and offering some changes in detail. After the command to keep silence, Matthew continues in more reflective fashion: "From that time began Jesus (Christ, *κ* B, but hardly likely to be original) to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things from the elders . . . and the third day be raised up" (16²¹); while Luke, after the injunction of silence, simply proceeds: "saying (that) the Son of man," etc., as in Mk., only concluding like Mt.: "and the third day be raised up" (9²²). But he omits the rebuke from St. Peter, which follows immediately after in Mk. and Mt., and passes to public (*πρὸς πάντας*) teaching on the need of self-denial from His followers. The omission of the "rejecting" in Matthew may have been an accident of transmission.

We can hardly be astonished at the horrified reproach from St. Peter, when he grasped the bearing of this new and revolutionary doctrine concerning the sacred person of the Messiah. We have no evidence that a suffering Messiah had been thought of at that time: indeed just herein seems to lie the interpretative originality of Jesus in giving due value to all the scriptures applicable to the bringer of the Kingdom.

The gloom may indeed have been unrelieved at first, but even if our Lord spoke of the certainty of His resurrection—as the transmitted texts imply—in order that He might be the instrument of the incoming of the Kingdom which He had preached, it was most naturally the darker side of the new teaching which absorbed the attention of His startled hearers.

The divergence between “after three days” and “the third day” need not trouble us, as representing a popular and proverbial expression for a very brief period, just like “the day after to-morrow” (ba’d bukra) of modern Palestine. The subsequent connecting of the initial appearances of the risen Lord with the Sunday following the Crucifixion would naturally favour the acceptance and persistence of “the third day” form in both oral and written tradition.¹

With the scanty information at our disposal we cannot say that Jesus did not use this self-designation before (cf. p. 182 ff.); but if He did so, the disciples seem never to have comprehended the intention of it until this occasion; combining as the title appears to do the novel conception of Messianic suffering with that of the coming majesty of the heavenly being which must have been to some extent familiar from the Similitudes of Enoch.

This mode of speech in the third person would seem to be transitional; although Jesus was probably quite

¹ For “after three days” cf. Lk 2⁴⁶; “the third day,” Lk 13³²; “in three days,” Mk 14⁵⁸, Mt 26⁶¹, Jn 2¹⁹; “three days,” Mk 8², Mt 15³².

convinced in Himself already that the functions of earth-born Messiah and heavenly Son of man were to be fulfilled by the divine figure of the new age, which His Son-consciousness revealed to be none other than Himself. Just so the very definiteness of the Matthean form in continuing the story manifests the reflexion of a later age to which the identity was axiomatic: "began to shew . . . how that he must go unto Jerusalem," etc. On the whole, it seems best to regard as justifiable the assumption that the clear, purposeful and educative usage of the title by the Master began in connexion and was mainly associated with this teaching utterly new to the disciples, albeit derived from the Scriptures, that suffering was the path to glory, that rejection preceded manifestation in divine power at the coming of the Kingdom; and with this inference the record of the Temptation experience is by implication in fundamental agreement. Nor shall we be far wrong if we assume that this idea of rejection was central to the unfamiliar doctrine, and that it was suggested—humanly speaking—by the general application of the Servant prophecies to Himself, and especially of that same "rejecting of men" which He came to foresee as inevitable in His own case (Is 53³). Now it would be too much to expect an accurate perspective even in Mark's series of predictions, moulded as they are with a suspicious symmetry which the other compilers reproduce; just as it is not likely either that the detailed forms which betray development within the synoptic narratives represent the literal

words or that the sayings were enunciated with the crisp precision with which they have been reported in the scheme of the second Gospel, and that just at critical points when one can hardly realise that they would be forgotten. Otherwise they must have been grasped by the apostles in a way in which they evidently were not, as the overwhelming shock of Calvary sufficiently demonstrates.

If subsequently to the re-tellers of these intimate revelations the Holy Spirit indeed brought all things to their remembrance (Jn 14²⁶), that does not make it any the less probable that the new light and later experiences wrought modifications even if unconscious in their reports of originally vaguer but authentic utterances of Jesus.

The next prediction of suffering which we possess in the Marcan record is much less certain, because of the difference of position and of wording in the Matthean parallel, and it is entirely wanting in Luke.

Our Lord's declaration that the Kingdom of God would come in power before the existing generation had passed away (9¹) seems to have roused the disciples to ask the question about the prior advent of Elijah which was popularly expected (11; cf. Lk 1¹⁷); while the Transfiguration story has not improbably been introduced (2-10) as illustrative of the "glory" of Jesus that should be revealed in His majestic appearing (8³⁸; contrast Mt 10^{82f.}).

In response to their questioning about the reconcilia-

tion of the near approach of the Kingdom with the teaching of the scribes in regard of Elijah, He says, according to the present form of Mark: "Elijah indeed cometh first and restoreth all things" (or it may be rendered as an interrogation); "and how is it written of (ἐπι) the Son of man, that he should suffer many things, and be set at nought (cf. Is 53³)? But I say unto you, that Elijah is indeed (ὅτι καὶ) come, and they did unto him whatsoever they willed, even as it is written of him" (9^{12f.}).

Now it is very plain that the reference to the Son of man (^{12b}) interferes as it stands with the contrast of the commonly accepted belief with the startling doctrine of our Lord that the expected Elijah had already come and suffered in the person of John the Baptist. If ^{12b} has been inserted, it is merely to be treated as an appendage to and a re-echoing of the first prediction elaborated after the Petrine confession; and it belongs to the fitness of things that the vision on the mountain should follow and confirm the new personal teaching which conjoined suffering with glory. It would be strange indeed, if the reference to the rejection of the Son of man were here authentic, for Matthew with his fondness for accumulating fulfilments of prophetic scriptures to have omitted it; but it is absent from his narrative. He gives the Lord's answer as: "Elijah indeed cometh and shall restore all things: but I say unto you that E. is come (aor.) already, and they recognised him not, but did with (ἐν) him whatsoever they willed";

and then he adds: "Even so shall the Son of man also suffer at their hands (μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπό)," together with the further comment on the previous passage: "Then understood the disciples that he spake unto them of John the Baptist" (17^{11ff.}). Now unless he omitted the Marcan reference to "scripture" because of his inability to find such concerning Elijah it can scarcely be supposed that Mt ^{12b} represents Mk ^{12b}, and the probability remains that in the recension which Mt. knew the parallel of the fate of the Son of man with that of John was not drawn. The setting and the implied contrast of the ignorance of others—the Jews—with the understanding of the disciples on this point do not encourage us to suppose that the incidental and brief ending to the verse in question is an authentic fragment of the Lord's instruction at this juncture. It would be unwise therefore to lay any stress on this instance of the use of the title Son of man, or to reckon it certainly as a separate prediction of suffering in the original Marcan plan.

2. The next announcement of the Passion programme is introduced in a summary and retrospective fashion, attached to the notice of a journey of our Lord *incognito* (*sc.* to the people as Messiah) through Galilee: "For he taught his disciples, and said unto them (impfs.), the Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him, and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again." Then Mark adds: "But they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask

him"; another testimony to the fact that only the Resurrection appearances opened their understanding, and that the predictions were not so definite as we have them, else were the obtuseness of the disciples inconceivable (9^{31f.}).

Luke keeps the same position, after the cure of the epileptic boy, only he emphasises the solemnity of the utterance, while endeavouring to excuse the disciples' dulness. "But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, Let these words sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall (μέλλει) be delivered up into the hands of men." Thus in this report the doom is undefined, and the gloom is unrelieved; which suggests either that the original utterance was similarly unclear, or that Luke prepares in this manner for the excuse which he appends: "But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it, and they were afraid (as in Mk.) to ask him about this saying" (9^{44f.}). Matthew, on the other hand, attaches the prediction at the same stage, saying that it was "when they were gathering together (probably, συστρεφόμενων) in Galilee"; only he has "shall be delivered" (as in Lk.), and omits the unnecessary "when he is killed," and, as previously, renders "the third day he shall be raised up." Then he keeps silent about the misunderstanding of so plain a statement, and merely adds: "and they were exceeding sorry" (17^{22f.}). In the three accounts the

entry into Capernaum ensues. Evidently in the view of Mark before this Galilean sojourn the deliverance up to the powers that he was already certain to Jesus, and had been spoken about to the disciples, possibly as in Luke without any word with regard to being raised up. Such a *παραδόσις* would signify primarily the process rather than the momentary act which came to be designated afterwards "the Betrayal," and would be quite generally expressed. We should expect that such strange and uncongenial teaching would have to be reiterated by reason of the natural conservatism of the disciples, and we should not be surprised to find an ascending series of predictions indicated as exhibiting an increasing clearness of detail. This is just what appears; although we may suspect that the definiteness has been overstated — unconsciously, it may be, in retelling after the event, and consequently at the same time the traditions in other respects really primitive would seem to exaggerate unfairly the dulness of the apostles.

3. It would be psychologically most probable that the firm conviction of impending disaster to Himself as the prophet of an unacceptable message would be communicated by Jesus to His faithful adherents in relatively more open terms on the journey towards the capital which He felt to be the appropriate scene of a prophet's perishing (Lk 13³³). Mark depicts this in vivid words which may reflect Petrine

reminiscence; while the others shrink apparently from the painful delineation of a slowly moving group of awestruck and fearsome intimates following the beloved Master whose forebodings were to them still incomprehensible.

Then once again He gathered to His side "the twelve," and "began to tell them," as he had done (in the transmitted record) twice before—with such a dramatic issue near Cæsarea Philippi, and, according to Mark's order, after the Transfiguration—"the things that were to happen to him, Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles, and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him, and after three days he shall rise again" (10^{32ff.}). Assuredly the last journey was a fitting occasion for warning His closest friends of His expectations, yet we can hardly imagine the unmistakable clearness which the transmitted form of the warning exhibits to have been misapprehended or forgotten when the crisis came. If Mark and Matthew were historically accurate in placing the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee immediately after this episode, it might be supposed that the two apostles seized upon the idea of the glory suggested by the mysterious and majestic heavenly figure of the Son of man as an offset to the

grim picture of the more definite prediction of the suffering that was to be previously endured; but it would be precarious to regard such a connexion as original.

Here again we find that the divergences in the traditions forbid us to lay stress on the details beyond the additional expressing of the conviction—in itself not improbable—that He would be handed over to the Roman authority, and possibly the inference that He would suffer the shameful treatment which their jurisdiction was likely to involve. Something of this sort, yet less definite than Mark's report, seems to be confirmed by the variations which the others manifest. Matthew has the mockery and the scourging, but omits the spitting; while he alone before the event (cf. Lk 24⁷) makes plain the mode of execution by the Roman sentence of crucifixion (20¹⁹). Luke, on the other hand, leaves the Jewish condemnation to be understood, and adds the general expression "and shall be shamefully entreated" (ὀβρισθήσεται) between the mockery and the spitting (18³²). Both writers again follow their usual custom of replacing "after three days" by "the third day" for the time of resurrection. But the third evangelist affords two other contributions peculiar to himself. He connects the passion of Jesus more closely with prophecy: "and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man" (31^b, cf. 24^{25ff.}).

He ascribes again and more emphatically the lack of apprehension of this still clearer announcement of victory through apparent doom to a providential purpose: "And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said" (⁸⁴). We may be excused for doubting whether the description was nearly so precise as the present form of the transmission would lead us to suppose, or the lack of comprehension on the part of close adherents so appalling. The combination of scourging, shame and spitting might, of course, have been suggested to Jesus by the memory of the fate of the Suffering Servant as described in the book of Isaiah (50⁶), and supported by His knowledge of the contemporary treatment of criminals; while the greater distinctness of the likeness to the actual event would be due to the conscious literary touch of Luke.

4. After the request of the ambitious brethren, Matthew agrees with Mark in attributing to our Lord in response thereto teaching illustrative of the true greatness of service, which formed a strong but much-needed corrective to the limited and material conceptions which the disciples entertained as to position in the coming Kingdom. The words in which Jesus refers to Himself under the mysterious title of Son of man as the supreme example of service may here be treated with and almost as an

echo of the preceding prediction of suffering. Owing to the introduction of legal and transactional theories the Oriental imagery has been obscured and the simplicity of the original figure lost to view.

The way to primacy is by performing a slave's office; "for verily (καὶ γάρ) the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mk 10⁴⁵; cf. 2^{19f.} 14^{7f.}, Mt 26^{11f.}, Jn 12^{7f.}). But for the connecting "even as" (ὥσπερ) the transmission is identical in Matthew (20²⁸).

The thought of the Servant passages runs below the surface here: his soul is a sin-offering; moreover by this sacrifice of his life he is represented as justifying many (for their service, εἵ δουλεύοντα, LXX¹¹) and even as bearing the sins of many (Is 53^{10ff.}). That the ultimate sacrifice had a redemptive value is a factor common to the prophecy and to the mind of Jesus; but the figure is not closely defined, and to press the ἀντὶ to express the subsequent doctrine of bald substitution is not only repugnant to the ethical sensitiveness of our time, but it would have no parallel in the teaching of the Master. Although it is an idea foreign to our modes of thought, the Jewish sacrifices were regarded as actually removing guilt. The efficacy of His supreme sacrifice, as the fullest manifestation of love through sonship and brotherhood, as beneficial to others in the coming of the Kingdom, which His own ultimate service would bring about, is the main point in view,

rather than any doctrine of atonement between God and man as such. This is made plain by Luke's arrangement; for he attaches the dispute about position and the consequent rebuke from Jesus to the story of the Last Supper, and represents the Lord as emphasising the lesson from His own example (cf. the feet-washing in Jn 13^{4ff.}): "for whether is greater, he that reclineth at a meal, or he that serveth? is not he that reclineth? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth" (22²⁷; cf. Mt 23^{11f.}). Jesus then proceeds—according to the position which this evangelist gives to a saying which we feel must belong to the primitive collection—to the brighter side in view for themselves, by promising dominion comparable to His own for those who had shared His "temptations" (23^{ff.}; cf. Mt 19²⁸). Now it undoubtedly makes us pause when we find Luke, the intimate friend of St. Paul, thus omitting all reference to the concluding clause with the "ransom" metaphor; yet it is insufficient and unsatisfactory to rid ourselves of a doubly attested clause, albeit not necessary to the previous argument, merely because with his teaching in mind it might be designated Pauline, for the figure was not strange to Jewish religious imagery. Another objection is that the Jesus of the Synoptists does not elsewhere, unless Lk 19¹⁰ be authentic, thus look back with the self-designation Son of man upon the purpose of His coming amongst men, and some ground is thus afforded for the hypothesis that

the application to Jesus as the supreme example of the self-sacrifice of service may have been appended as a reason for (Mk.) or an illustration of (Mt.) the teaching immediately preceding. Yet we may probably see in the Vineyard story (Mk 12^{1ff.} ||) a veiled retrospect and a gloomy prospect (cf. 14⁸), and we may compare the negatively expressed notes of purpose in the first person which Mt. especially records (5¹⁷ 9¹³ 10³⁴ (cf. Lk 12⁵¹) 15²⁴). If the conception of His life, shortly to be cut off by a violent death, as having in its entirety a redemptive value for others were indeed expressed in some such manner by Jesus, it would be with a forward rather than a backward look. The death which He foresees as imminent He has come to regard—without closely defining the manner of its potency, and without telling when or how He reached that conclusion—as the highest service which He can render to His fellows; the meaning of that sacrificial service being hidden in the Father's purpose, but felt to be a pre-condition for His coming Messianic dignity as well as for their bliss in the Kingdom. But this is not necessarily to admit that the clause just as we have it was uttered by Jesus, for the silence of Luke must be allowed weight, unless that arose from the feeling that the symbolism was unsuitable for Gentile readers; and the voluntary "giving" or laying down of life would seem to be related to the phraseology which marks the reflective or Johannine period.

Evidently to the evangelists Son of man could only mean Jesus here, and therefore the reference may also be reckoned among the examples of a strictly personal use; although the verse may be indeed universalised by application to all human service in its vicarious relationships.

This saying has held a prominent position in the development of the theories of the Atonement both Eastern and Western, from Origen to Anselm and since; but it neither contains one in itself—for to the Jew the forensic question of the destination of the voluntary self-offering would not arise, nor does it teach any literal substitution—for it is the language of symbolism, not of the commercial transaction of an exchange. For Jewish teaching on the redemptive value of Messiah's sufferings, reference may be made to *bab Sanh 93^b 98^a*; *bab Sukkah 52^{ab}*, and the later stories concerning Messiah ben Joseph (*Wünsche, op. cit.*, 103 ff.).

5. Two other Marcan instances of the use of the title Son of man are related to the thought of His being delivered up, and therefore may be dealt with here in connexion with the Passion programme.

The one follows on the prediction of delivery by one of the twelve, and affords scriptural grounds for it, referring presumably to the Servant prophecy or perhaps to the Psalmist's words (41⁹): "For the Son of man goeth (his way), even as it is written of him: but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man

is delivered up! good were it for him if that man had not been born" (14²¹).

But for the omission of the introductory particle, Matthew transmits the saying in the same way (26²⁴); he adds, however, the shameless question from Judas himself, which though psychologically possible leaves no trace in the sequel, and seems rather to reflect the horror of later days (25).

In each of these Gospels the "institution" of the Lord's Supper is narrated immediately afterwards. Luke again in this case keeps on his way of independent arrangement, probably because of information which he deemed more reliable for reasons which we cannot know for certainty. He places the warning of imminent betrayal after his twofold or conflated record of the institution at the final common meal, and relates the ground therefor in language suggestive of a Pauline colouring: "For the Son of man indeed goeth (*πορεύεται*), as it hath been determined (*κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμὲνον*), but woe," etc., yet he leaves out the clause in Aramaic idiom about being better unborn.

Having thus supplied the motive first, he then recounts the questioning of the disciples "among themselves," and follows it up with the remarkable contrast of their strife about precedence, and the subsequent teaching on the greatness of lowly ministry (22^{22ff.}). It is to be remarked also that in this solemn affirmation of imminent treachery there is no mention made of the ensuing resurrection, or of the phases of

suffering to be endured (as in Mk 10^{33f.} ||). Indeed, no predictions at all of passion or of resurrection seem to have been contained in Q's collections of sayings.

This instance, if authentic, would be another example of the personal use of the term.

6. The other allusion to the delivering up of the Son of man is inserted into the last words of Jesus before the Betrayal both in Mark and Matthew. As the verse-portion appears obviously to emphasise an exact foreknowledge on the part of the Lord of what was going to happen to Him immediately, and at the same time breaks the connexion of His words, while the act is unmentioned in this position by the third evangelist, it would be unwise to lay any stress upon it; nor does it contribute anything further to the Passion predictions as before announced. After the last return to the tired apostles in the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus bids them rest on, and then suddenly after an exclamation (Mark) on hearing the approach of the emissaries of His foes says: "Arise, let us go: behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand" (Mk 14⁴², Mt 26⁴⁶). But before the command to rise, both evangelists have in almost identical terms: "The hour is come, behold the Son of man is delivered up into (the) hands of (the) sinners" (Mk 41^b, Mt 45^b). Apart from this rounded phrase, we have in striking contrast the sharp *staccato* utterances of a profound crisis, the final step to certain death, which was to be the condition of ushering in the new age. Luke once

more describes the scene differently, from the outside, as it were, while Mark's vivid narration reflects the experience of actual participants. Jesus found the disciples sleeping for grief, "and said unto them, Why sleep ye? Arise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation" (as ^{40b}), and then the author proceeds: "while he was yet speaking, behold a multitude, and he called Judas, one of the twelve, approached them, and came near to Jesus to kiss him" (22^{46f.}). It seems that Luke's omission may be ascribed to a readjustment of his material rather than to the absence of the sentence about the Son of man from his copy of Mark, or else it may be due to a report of the occurrence which he regarded as more reliable. having caused him to leave out the words in question to the disciples, and to put the title into the Lord's mouth later in addressing the betrayer (⁴⁸, cf. p. 179). At such a moment as this, however, the third personal form of speech appears both inappropriate and unlikely: it reads almost like a warning to the listeners to tell them in Isaianic terms (53¹²) that the *dénoûment* of the παραδόσις is approaching.

7. Before we leave the predictions of the Passion, we must notice passages in single transmission which exhibit the title Son of man in connexion with deliverance up as the significant phase of the suffering.

In Luke's unique apocalyptic account of words uttered concerning "the days" or "the day of the Son of man," he adds a comment: "but first" (*i.e.* before the time of His triumphant manifestation) "must he suffer

many things, and be rejected of this generation" (17²⁵), re-echoing verbally the first prediction (9²²). We gain nothing then from this additional verse which belongs to the author's setting rather than to the original sayings—probably from Q—which are incorporated in a slightly divergent 'recension in Matthew's eschatological chapter (24^{26ff.}).

8. Then we have from the third Gospel again a retrospective summary of the Lord's foretellings of His suffering placed in the mouth of the "two men" at the tomb (24^{6f.}) in a manner which harmonises the Galilean and Jerusalem traditions of the Resurrection appearances: "Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up (as 9²²) into the hands of sinful men (Mk 14⁴¹), and be crucified (Mt 20¹⁹ only), and the third day rise again" (*ἀναστῆναι*).

These phrases are at any rate represented as being but the echoes of utterances of Jesus, testifying to some such predictions having been made and remembered if not understood during the ministry; but they do not enable us any more to recover the exact form of those revelations of suffering to come in connexion with the mysterious self-application of the title Son of man. In this case the term seems to have become already a recognised Jewish-Christian designation for the Lord.

9. Matthew affords us a further instance of a reverential addition to the Master's reported words, in

order to make it plain that He knew beforehand, and in dated detail, the doom that was impending (despite the evidence of Mk 13³², and the different meaning of the parallel verse in the source, Mk 14¹). After the last parable group is concluded, 'he opens his next section with a solemn assertion on the part of Jesus to the disciples: "Ye know that after two days cometh the Passover (cf. Allen, *in loc.*, for a suggested solution of the dating), and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified" (26², cf. 20¹⁹). The implication of the insertion would seem to be that Jesus was fully aware of the meeting of the conspirators, and of their plans as described in the verses immediately succeeding. Except for the other secondary allusion already noted (⁴⁵), there is no trace of our Lord's using this designation which combined the ideas of present humiliation and future majesty during the solemn closing hours. This is not, however, to deny that the firm conviction of coming betrayal may have been expressed once more, only that the terminology was so definite.

We have yet to examine the instances in all other connexions, but even thus far we must feel that the usage of the term Son of man is established in both forms of the primitive tradition concerning Jesus; and that to Mark it was chiefly in connexion with the foretelling of suffering, humiliation and disaster totally unexpected for the Messiah by the disciples (and there seems no trace of a Jewish doctrine of a suffering Messiah till after the second century A.D.)

that the title came to have a new and personal connotation. But the evidence of the data adduced in the predictions of the Passion suggests that an early currency of this peculiarly Jewish designation as a name for Jesus, by way of a solemn equivalent for the first personal pronoun, brought about by means of additions an apparent increase in the number of occurrences over and above the authentic instances which had been transmitted; such additions being of an interpretative and secondary nature, especially with relation to the "delivering up" of Jesus.

The conclusion to which our inquiry so far appears to have led us is this: that the name of the heavenly figure from parts of the Jewish apocalyptic literature, Danielic and Enochic, was taken over of set purpose by our Lord, and used of Himself—for reasons which we can never expect to grasp adequately—in relation to His coming Passion and death, as well as in view of the glory which should follow, and which befitted the manifestation of the Messiah, the Elect, the Son of man.

We must now turn to observe the nature and the distribution of the passages wherein the appellation is made use of with regard to such appearing, coming and judging in glory.

B. THE PREDICTIONS OF COMING

(a) *In Majesty*

Whatever may have been the history of the term Son of man, traceable back perhaps—as the researches

of Gressmann and others would seem to indicate—to the mists of non-Jewish mythology; reflecting at one time notions of a primal Man, Adam (Ezekiel; cf. Paul's "first man"), at another suggesting the conception of a divine being taken over into Jewish speculation as a quasi-angelic intermediary (Dan.; cf. Man from sea, Apoc. Ezra); again recalling the figure personifying the ideal Israel that was to constitute the kingdom of the saints (Dan.); and once more the pre-existent hidden being, identified with the Chosen one, who was the Messiah to be (Sim. Enoch), it will be noticed that the various aspects manifested during the development of apocalyptic speculation (saving the first named) display one common characteristic, the majesty or glory of the divinely appointed and divinely sent personage who is to appear from heaven upon earth to bring the new age for the people of Israel.

If it was indeed the novel teaching about an unthought of career of humiliation, rejection and suffering which arrested the attention and roused the opposition of disciples, when they realised that this mysterious being, identified with the earth-born Messiah of the older and more popular expectation, was none other than their own Master in the flesh; this effect was naturally due to the utter contradiction of inherited beliefs and current conceptions which the foretelling of Jesus involved.

But when we look closer, we discover that the

glorious manifestation for which they longed, and which they associated with the appearance of that Son of man, the Elect, the Anointed, God's Vice-gerent, was held and taught just as earnestly by Jesus; only that He realised from inward and outward experience in a way which they had not done that the human stage of preparation, repudiation and passion even unto death was to be the preliminary thereto, just because He alone in His Son-consciousness had come to know that the central figure of the future restoration would be none other than Himself. The more He attained to the realisation that an awful doom, humanly speaking, was imminent for Himself, the more He was confident that the Father would establish Him through and after death by a divine act in representative dominion over the faithful, the righteous and elect, the "remnant" responsive to His message and to the summons of His emissaries.

We can, after all, only reverently guess at the processes of thought in the mind of Jesus; but even when the references have been reduced to an approximately reliable minimum we shall find that, despite the revulsion of horror which the apostles experienced at the thought of a suffering Christ, to the mind of Jesus there ever loomed afar beyond the gloom of passion the vision of great glory, through the bitter humiliation the God-given majesty, after human rejection divine dominion. In a word, if we are correct in assuming that our Lord identified

Himself with that Son of man of the apocalyptic hope, we cannot well avoid the conclusion that in the new age on a transformed earth He felt assured that He would be the central personality. This programme of majesty we must now trace from His teaching.

1. The first utterance concerning the glory of Jesus as Son of man is found very appropriately just after the Petrine confession and the subsequent prediction of suffering, and is represented as concluding an address on the self-sacrifice necessary for His adherents which was spoken to "the crowd" as well as to the disciples. If the occasion be correctly reported, the distinction between the first personal pronoun and the Son of man as an apocalyptic figure may be intentional; else we should have to suppose, if the differentiation in the text be pressed, that the identity of the coming Son of man with Himself had not as yet been fully apprehended. According to the Marcan record, our Lord had spoken of the supreme value of the soul above all earthly gains, and the saving thereof for the future age (cf. Jn 12²⁵) is closely connected with a man's relationship to Himself and to His message: "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (8³⁸). The idea of "coming" serves to bring earthward in Danielic manner (7¹³) the heavenly figure of Enochic vision (69²⁹).

The other Synoptists report the same saying in the same context, but Matthew, having already transmitted from the second source at an earlier stage in his Gospel (10^{22f}, see below) a similar utterance about "confessing" and "denying" Jesus, leaves out the allusion to being "ashamed," but preserves the mention of the coming, while he gives his own peculiar appendage as to the issue thereof for the individual; thus reading (16²⁷): "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul? for the Son of man shall (*μᾶλλον*) come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he render to every man according to his doing" (*πρᾶξιν*, cf. Ps 62¹²). Luke passes over the strong and peculiarly Jewish expression by which our Lord designated His contemporaries, thereby rendering the time of coming more indefinite, and he makes the Son's glory more emphatic by differentiating thus: "When he cometh in his own glory (cf. En 62^{3.5} etc.), and of the Father, and of the holy angels" (9²⁶). These linguistic alterations are evidently due to the compiler, and the Marcan form is presumably as near as we can get to the original, only provided that his recension is not merely—as seems probable—a partial variant or rather doublet of the eschatologically less-defined form preserved in the dual tradition.

It is to be noted that here, for the first time in the second Gospel, God is spoken of as "his Father," with the consequent implication of the divine sonship of Jesus,

who is identified of course by the author with the Son of man.

We are not, however, left without other evidence for a saying or sayings like this; for Q included this, or one of very similar content, although the title Son of man is used only in one form of its transmission. After the teaching on divine care illustrated by the sparrows, which are relatively of little value in comparison with the souls of men, Matthew continues: "Everyone therefore who shall confess me (*ὁμολογῆν ἐν*) before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in the heavens. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in the heavens" (10^{32f.}).

Luke in the parallel, perhaps recalling the similar Marcan passage which he had but recently written down (9²⁶), replaced the first personal pronoun by "the Son of man" (unless this more indirect form really belongs to Q), and the peculiarly Jewish circumlocution for God by "the angels of God," a phrase which is not indeed likely to have been authentic. He further makes stylistic changes in the second member of the saying (*ἐνώπιον* for *ἔμπροσθεν*), uses the passive form—which to the Jew often served to indicate a divine act (*ἀπαρνηθήσεται*), and locates the solemn denial also "in the presence of the angels of God" (12^{8f.}). He proceeds at once to append—presumably as being connected in sense—the utterance concerning "a word against the Son

of man," seeing that the interpretation already current applied this passage to the person of the Lord (cf. p. 190 ff.). There appears to be no reason why these ideas of open confession, denial, and public repudiation should not have been thus mysteriously expressed by our Lord in relation to Himself; with the inward assurance that those who so treated Him and His message—either with loyalty or with disrespect—would receive from God due recognition or condemnation upon His own evidence in His Messianic dignity. But it is implied that He would thus be the chief Witness and not the Judge: and this is an important contribution for us to possess from the most primitive collection of sayings as to the future functions of Jesus (Mt 10²⁸, Lk 12⁵). Further, in these parallel verses from Q there is no reference to an eschatological coming as in the Marcan recension of the utterance.

2. The next occurrence of words concerning the glorious coming of the Son of man lies in that material which is widely supposed to belong to a Jewish-Christian apocalypse—which the present writer regards as marking the beginning of that line of development which issues in the descriptions of Gehenna and Paradise found in the Apocalypse of Peter and similar compositions intended to satisfy in some degree the human craving for information upon subjects about which Jesus appears to have preserved an intentional reticence. But it is quite

feasible to admit that if a separate source be utilised here by the compiler of our second Gospel, it may embody teaching and even words of the Master; at any rate for its incorporation it must have been supposed to be in general harmony with His utterances from time to time relative to "the last things." The suspected verses may not have been contained in the eschatological chapter as known to the author of Ap Peter.

All the Synoptists agree, after the warning about the celestial (and terrestrial, Lk.) phenomena, in giving words reminiscent of the verse in Daniel (7¹³) which must have come to be accepted as a saying of the Lord, although of course if ever forming part of a purely Jewish apocalypse not originally referring to Jesus: "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory" (Mk 13²⁶). Matthew omits "then," because he has used it in his inserted clause (24^{30a}) about "the sign of the Son of man": but he alters the close to the expression more suggestive of divinity, "on the clouds," adding "of heaven," and he transposes the attribute "great," applying it to the "glory" (30^b). Luke writes "cloud" only, and concludes with the same order of words as the first Gospel (21²⁷).

The Messianic motive of the ingathering of the elect from all quarters at the sound of the trumpet's blast (Mt., cf. Did 16⁶) by means of angel messengers—a common Jewish trait, cf. Paul, Apoc., Rabbinic

writings—follows both in Mark and Matthew; but Luke, possibly because of its especially Jewish colouring, avoids this, and inserts a word of encouragement, because “these things” constitute for the Christians a sign of approaching “redemption” (Lk 21²⁸), and then he passes, as do the others, to the parable of the Fig-tree as a token of the nearness of the Kingdom (^{29ff.}). It is not improbable that this pictorial and indirect reply was part of the original answer of our Lord to the question of the apostles; an inquiry to which a fuller and more explicit revelation came to be desired, and was afterwards supplied, progressing in detail as time went on. In regard of this instance of the use of the term Son of man in connexion with a glorious coming, we can hardly forbear to remark—without entering upon any intricate discussion of this peculiar apocalyptic stratum—the unique aloofness and detachment which exceed that reserved and delicate third personal mode of speech which appears to be well established for Jesus. The interest in the celestial catastrophe seems literary and traditional rather than urgent and practical; and it is other people—those Jewish rejectors, as the form is appropriated by Christians—“they” shall see to their own dismay and condemnation the coming of the Son. The elect, if they were originally described as “his” (D, etc., om.), must surely be interpreted of the disciples of Jesus, although the current apocalyptic phraseology for the gathering in of the dispersed

Jews has been taken over. We seem then, even in this small fragment of the material, to be standing outside the lifetime of the Master; yet teaching which reflects a conviction that the Messianic act of separation would be delegated to Him may be embedded therein amid realistic native speculation. The very fact of the title being used for Jesus dates the composition in the early days, because the Semitic designation was inadequate and capable of misapprehension for the universal mission in the Hellenistic world, seeing that we cannot regard the application of the idea of representative Man as admissible at that time to explain it. We accept this reference therefore as a token of what was believed to have been conformable with our Lord's teaching as to Himself, but not as contributing anything to our real knowledge of that teaching (see Note, p. 205).

3. The so-called triple tradition supplies us with one other occurrence of the term applied by Jesus obviously to Himself as conscious of possessing the full prerogatives of future majesty. It is in the momentous scene before the Court of the Sanhedrin at a very early hour on Good Friday morning. He had bowed to the Father's will. His doom, humanly speaking, was sealed. Even for the sake of such as were not hostile, but had not perceived the meaning of the entry of the humble king, nor had grasped the purport of the claim to upraise a spiritual sanctuary in a brief interval to replace the material edifice, there was nothing to be gained by

silence or circumlocution now. Some have been troubled by the supposed difficulty of knowing what transpired at this hurried meeting in the night-time (assuming its historicity), forgetting that a legal process with closed doors was not and is not an Oriental custom. The main facts of the sitting would soon find their way to the adherents of our Lord, and inquiry could be satisfied even after the regathering of the craven and scattered band. The important thing is this, and it comes out clearly with nothing artificial about it to suggest invention, that Jesus of set purpose broke His silence when asked (on oath, according to Mt.) by the religious head of His people: "Art thou the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?" (*i.e.* God, Mk 14⁶¹; cf. the common Rabbinic circumlocution, "The Holy One, blessed be He!"). The fact is the same for Matthew and Luke, although their phrasing is a little less direct and vivid. There was no need for anything but the straight question as to His claim, which they recognised that He had made, but rejected as impossible and fatuous, seeing that His career had contradicted all their cherished Messianic expectations.

We must set down, however, the three forms in which the decisive answer has been transmitted. Mark for his non-Palestinian readers makes the affirmation quite unambiguous: "And Jesus said, I am (*ἐγώ εἰμι*), and ye shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of the Power (*i.e.* God) and coming with the clouds of heaven" (14⁶²). Thus He would appear to have combined de-

liberately the figure of Daniel's vision with the picture of the Messianic king in co-session with God from the Psalmist (110; cf. 20th), and from Enoch (62^d etc.). In such a momentous scene, tense with excitement and the outburst of zealous horror and religious passion, is it not sufficient that the fundamental fact is well attested? Is it not indeed more natural and more convincing rather than otherwise that there should be deviations in the verbal detail of the reports? The ear-witnesses were not official stenographers, if indeed any such were likely to have been present on an occasion of this sort. And the investigation by the Roman governor—with the "title" upon the cross for consequence—would seem to be without motive if the claim to Messiahship had not been made openly at last; for the higher and transcendental claim, albeit blasphemy to Jews, would afford no legal ground for condemnation by Pilate.

Matthew reports the reply to the high priest's adjuration thus: "Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said (*οὐ δένεις*, also an evident though less direct affirmative): nevertheless, I say unto you, Henceforth (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) ye shall see . . . on the clouds of heaven" (26th), as if the very confirmation of their finally expressed suspicion involved their own condemnation at His hands in the near future. For such terms a progressive but unseen moral sway supplies an inadequate and too modern explanation.

This self-accusation, according to the following verse (27), dispensed with any need for further legal testi-

mony as to what they regarded as the blasphemy concerning the Temple (cf. Jn 2¹⁹). Luke displays his own individuality in the manner in which he records the crisis of the trial. For Gentile readers unfamiliar with the judicial routine of Jerusalem he generalises: "they brought him" . . . "tell us," and inserts—on what grounds we do not know—"if I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask, ye will not answer (or let me go, syr. sin., etc.). But from henceforth (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (a redundancy of which no Jew would be guilty). Then he duplicates the test question with a Christianised significance of expression, and again without indication of any representative spokesman: "And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am (ὁμῶς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι). And they said, What further need have we of witness," etc. (22^{67ff.}). The point to be noticed herein—apart from the rearrangement which scarcely seems harmonious with the mode of the speech of Jesus elsewhere—is the omission of the Danielic part of the response: "and coming with (or on) the clouds of heaven."

This makes us pause. If he knew it, why did Luke omit it? Did he regard it as a figure unsuited to his readers? but then he accepts it in his later narrative of the Ascension appearance in the sequel (Ac 1^{9ff.}).

It would seem justifiable to conclude either that information from his master St. Paul, from St. Philip at

Cæsarea, from some apostle or "ancient disciple" led him to exclude the last clause; or else at the least that the tradition as to the actual words was still in a fluid state, and the Mark which he used did not include them: and indeed, the second Gospel has only one other public announcement—and that, as we saw, but doubtfully authentic—of a coming in glory (8³⁸), except in the apocalyptic passage (13²⁶). Yet even if in the Trial scene Mark has compressed the Lord's answer into an over-terse explicitness, the claim to Messiahship and more than His judges understood thereby is asseverated in the other records, albeit implicitly. The full dignity of that office would be revealed in their lifetime, then they would perforce recognise Him. But Luke and Matthew alike break through the Jewish limitations and prejudices of the event in its historical circumstances, and looking beyond the foreshortening of the time lead their readers onward to the thought of the universal Lord of Christian faith, "the Son of God," the complete exercise of whose regal and judicial prerogatives is still future.

(b) *Undefined*

We must now turn to consider such passages in discourses attributed to Jesus as have reference to the future coming of the Son of man without any further definition or description of that coming, whether they are found in dual or in single transmission.

1. The first and third Gospels exhibit an utterance in

identical terms and in the same immediate context, but with a different general arrangement of material ; thus pointing to a common written source for it, probably Q. The doubly transmitted saying in question is this: "Be ye also ready ; for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh." It is the sort of saying which may have been spoken on several occasions relative to preparedness for the Kingdom, and so for the coming of that Son of man, which was coincident therewith. Luke places the utterance comparatively early, in the complex material associated with the journey towards Jerusalem, among discourses which have no certain occasion ascribed, seeing that they are reported as being addressed now to the disciples (12²²), now to the multitudes (54). Sayings about the loving care of God are followed by the encouragement of self-sacrificing adherents (22ff.), who are then exhorted to a readiness just as if they were slaves with "lamps burning," waiting for an expected master (35-38). And the thought of the master forms the link of attachment for the brief similitude of the thief, for whom the householder would have watched had he known when his dwelling's earthen exterior was going to be dug through (39). Thus we can easily imagine the Lord pointing the application to personal effort for readiness as He turned to the listeners, whether they were limited to intimate followers or not, with the words of the verse under consideration (40). After this the third evangelist represents Peter as inquiring whether the parable applies to them or to all ; and further parabolic

teaching about a steward's faithfulness and the terrible reminder that divisions in a household (cf. Ap Ez 5⁹ 6²⁴) constitute part of the commonly expected "woes" of Messiah ensue (⁴¹⁻⁵³).

Matthew, however, with his freer subject-grouping, locates these utterances at the close of his eschatological chapter, after the composite discourse concerning "the end" which in the Marcan transmission concluded with the similitude of the fig-tree's leaves and the warning to watch, because even the Son knew not the day nor hour. But the first evangelist appends to this warning a comparison with the doom of the indifferent in the days of Noah, and teaching to the effect that there will be a sudden separation of companions at their work when the Son of man's "presence" is revealed. This is found in a slightly divergent and fuller recension in Luke's earlier apocalyptic context, apparently derived from Q (17^{26ff.}).

Then Matthew inserts our saying with a definitely Christian turn given to it: "Watch therefore: for ye know not on what day *your* Lord cometh" (24⁴²); after which he reproduces in almost identical words the figures which we found in the third Gospel about the thief and the householder, only introducing our exact saying with "therefore" (⁴⁴), and then continuing with the similitude of the "faithful and wise" slave, which succeeds in Luke to Peter's question, but here it is in somewhat briefer form (⁴⁵⁻⁵¹). He relates immediately afterwards the parable of the Ten Virgins, which apparently corre-

sponds with that of the slaves awaiting their bridegroom master narrated before the thief simile and our text in Luke, and bears the same lesson: "Watch therefore, for ye know not the day nor the hour" (25¹⁻¹³).

The combination of similarity and divergence which these passages manifest suggests that the common source was not immediate, and that each evangelist, especially the first according to his wont, has permitted himself freedom in grouping and editing, although fragments of discourse relative to readiness for the Kingdom or for the revelation of the Son of man would tend naturally to be linked together in Christian preaching and instruction because of the urgency of expectation. We may remember that familiarity with such teaching is evidenced by St. Paul's words: "Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night" (1 Th 5²). At the time of the compiling of the narratives the coming of the Kingdom, the day of the Lord, the advent of the Son of man, were to the faithful only different aspects of one event, the close of the present conditions and the in-breaking of the new age, and consequently their vindication, their redemption. In the case that we have been considering there is no reason to suppose that the lesson of the thief figure may not have been pointed by Jesus, although the application was so easily adaptable for primitive Christian exhortation, seeing that it directed the thoughts of men to our Lord's return. Assuming, however, the authenticity of the saying, it would be most appropriate

to place it in the later stages of the ministry, on the way towards or in Jerusalem.

2. We have two other instances in Luke alone in which the coming of the Son of man is definitely named; but one is retrospective, and the authenticity of both is doubtful. At the close of the parable of the Unjust Judge, which is peculiar to this Gospel, although quite possibly found among Q's indirect parables of the Kingdom, we have the following words: "And the Lord said"—the title evidencing a later stratum of tradition, or at any rate a lapse on the part of the compiler into the contemporary habit of speech, "Hear what the unrighteous judge saith. And shall not God avenge his elect (cf. En 47²), which cry to him day and night, and he is long-suffering over them? I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find (the) faith on the earth?" (18^{6ff.}). Now, while this comment, if thus addressed to the first listeners—for the vengeance idea seems alien to the spirit of Jesus—would refer to the Jews' yearning for the divine interference, it would soon be applicable for the Christians to divine justification against their foes and relief from persecution, and the conclusion (^{8b}) looks very like an appendage by way of a preaching or reading "aside," and rather dismal at that, for it contradicts the hopeful stimulus of the story to persevering prayer.

Apart from this internal improbability of the sentence, the language is hardly Lucan ($\pi\lambda\eta$ is not found

otherwise in this sense, 22²² is different: the coming is visualised as past (ἐλθών), and the consequence is presented to the mind: ἄρα and ἡ πίστις do not occur elsewhere in the Gospel). Should we be far wrong in regarding these closing words as a sombre reflexion suggested by some apostasy amid persecution, a grim comment on the speedy (ἐν τάχει) vindication just spoken of, expected in the Kingdom's advent, in contrast with what the glorified Lord would actually find at His glorious appearing after the prolonged delay had damped the early enthusiasm? Yet, on the other hand, it might serve a brighter purpose in primitive homiletics to stimulate afresh persistent prayer and glowing confidence. There seems no reason to limit and crystallise "the faith," as if it meant "fides quæ creditur," because the very use of the Jewish title shows that the reflexion is of relatively early date.

3. In the next chapter, at the close of the Zacchæus episode, also peculiar, we have a similar comment introduced, using the appellation in question; only this time it is a retrospective one concerning the purpose of the first "coming," not the full and glorious Messianic manifestation of which Jesus was confident, and for which the Christians looked and still look but in a more spiritual manner. It is again of the nature of a gloss on a word in the preceding sentence, within which, unless it be intended as spoken to the bystanders, an inconsistency is observable in the use of the pronouns: "Jesus said unto him, To-day is salva-

tion come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham" (although a despised tax-collector). "Salvation come": yes, says the preacher or reader, in the person of the Lord, "for" that was just the aim of His advent, to fit men for the Kingdom: "the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost" (19¹⁰), as was the promise to Ezekiel of old (34¹⁶; cf. En 48⁷ 62¹³).

There is, of course, the possibility that the famous "ransom" phrase (Mk 10⁴⁵ ||) already noted may have had a similar origin outside the actual words of Jesus. We possess another such clause (but not included in the oldest texts), in answer to the proposal of the sons of Zebedee relative to the destruction of an unreceptive Samaritan village, which adds to "he turned and rebuked them" the supposed reason for the Lord's mercy: "for the Son of man came not to destroy but to save men's lives" (Lk 9^{55b}). The later MSS. exhibit the same saying after the words about the angels of "the little ones" being in the presence of God: "for the Son of man came to save the lost" (Mt 18¹¹; cf. 1 Ti 1¹⁵). These phenomena might lead us to infer that some such reflexion upon an aspect of His ministerial work may have been authentically reported from Jesus, remembered in floating tradition, and attached in different places to Gospel narratives.

Here once more the linguistic evidence is against the verse which we have been discussing and illustrating (*ἦλθεν* for the Son follows awkwardly on *ἐγένετο* for *σωτηρία*, while *τὸ ἀπολλῶς*, of which John is fond, does

not occur otherwise in Luke). The Messiah, before His "glorious resurrection," is thus already regarded as the Saviour of men in His earthly manifestation, somewhat in the Johannine manner.

4. Matthew supplies the remaining instance of the designation Son of man in connexion with the bare fact of His coming. In the course of the charge to "the twelve," into which the evangelist probably collects from more than one source fragments recalled from more than one momentous conversation, we have (10¹⁻²³) the actual directions for the itinerary of His messengers, and the warning as to unreceptive towns; succeeded by the Marcan eschatological passage (13⁹⁻¹³) about the preparation of the apostles for impending persecution, and to this an ideal and universal colouring is given by the closing words "and to the nations" (18) at least, including the encouraging promise of the Spirit's aid in their defence before human tribunals, and the familiar "woe" of domestic strife before Messiah's manifestation. Then a final behest is given to hurry on from town to town when their enemies are pursuing them, that the message of the Kingdom may be spread afar; and this verse-portion (23^b) supplies the reason afforded by the Lord with solemn asseveration: "for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through (*i.e.* completed the visitation of, τελέσητε) the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come" (ἕως ἔλθῃ).

The very discontinuity of these utterances bears

witness that they cannot well belong to a single report or even to one mission-instruction; and the latter part generally—as well as the teachings subsequent to our text concerning the disciple suffering like the Master, the divine care amidst trial; then, once more, as to coming domestic divisions, and the blessedness of receiving disciples (²⁴⁻⁴²)—exhibits evidently fragments of instruction and warning that must belong to a late stage of our Lord's ministry, when the outlook, humanly speaking, for Him and for them also was dark. Moreover, it has to be borne in mind that some regulations for evangelising from a post-resurrection period may have found incorporation as for a missionary manual, and the double form in which the instructions are reproduced in the Lucan transmission lends probability to this supposition.

All this serves to confirm the authenticity of our saying, which is hardly likely to have been a later invention of Jewish-Christian narrowness. Indeed, in the opening of the primitive charge, which must at any rate reflect the remarkable injunctions reported presumably in Q, if it does not reproduce the very words of Jesus, we have this same limitation as is implied in our verse just quoted—and naturally it is omitted also by Luke—imposed in so many words: "Go not into (any) way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (⁵¹). Such a behest is in direct contradiction to the later universal tone of the com-

mands, justifiable enough as inferences from apostolic experience, which are incorporated in the compilation of this same evangelist; *e.g.* "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole inhabited world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come" (24¹⁴), and, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations," etc. (28¹⁹); unless indeed we strive to save these utterances—which apparently presuppose the victory of the Pauline policy—for literal words of our Lord by an application of them to Jewish(-Christian) proselytising efforts among the heathen. But even that cannot be said to eliminate the contradiction. Moreover, our Lord's own rule, conscious as He seems to have been of national restrictions in the office of Messiah under the conditions of His earthly life—although the breaking through them was inherent in the principles of His teaching, was to reserve His message of the Kingdom and His acts of healing for Jews only. The struggle in His human mind when an exception was made beyond the northern border is obvious from the report of the scene in the case of the Syro-Phœnician suppliant: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15²⁴), where the limitations of His official consciousness, if we may so speak, are expressed in terms of the same figure from Ezekiel (34^{15f.}). Mark also records the fact, but not the words (7²⁷). The same thought of the restriction of the tidings to pure Jews appears probably in another form in the un-

connected saying about "the dogs" and "the swine," which is incorporated in the Sermon material (Mt 7⁶); and also in the representation of the redeemed Israel as being under the dominion of the apostles (19²⁸, Lk 22³⁰); not to speak of the absence of any universal conception on the part of the apostles themselves before the Cornelius episode as related in Acts (10^{1ff.}).

So we conclude that this saying takes its place among the many utterances which go to show that our Lord expected the Kingdom, and therefore His own glorious manifestation as Son of man, within a comparatively brief time (cf. Mk 9¹ 13³⁰ etc.), whose duration was, however, unknown to Himself. The work of the messengers was urgent, and nothing must hinder the rapid dissemination of their tidings from place to place. It appears only conformable with His perfect humanity to admit that the Prophet of Nazareth experienced that foreshortening of time-relations which is a trait of all intense and exalted prophecy. It is furthermore a testimony to the general reliability of our sources that they incorporate in-harmonious utterances from various strata of evangelical tradition. It is just this fresh *naïveté* which preserves to us twigs from the living stock of a vigorous and growing tradition, derived from different sources and documents, persons and places, and proves that the Synoptic Gospels are not the imaginative creation of conscious art.

Before we proceed to set forth the indications of the

prerogatives which Jesus would assume when He appeared as Son of man and of the functions which He would exercise, we should remind ourselves of those Marcan predictions which we have already noticed (in the previous section) from the standpoint of suffering especially; because they tell us the way in which He probably contemplated the passage to the prolonging of His days (to use the Isaianic expression), the way from humiliation to majesty.

As the sayings have been handed down, although we feel compelled to suspect that the indications were not originally so clear, the divine act of resurrection is the mode by which He expects to pass to His glorious manifestation. Not only was the resurrection of faithful Israelites at least, if not of all the chosen people, an accepted tenet of the national religion under the influence of the Pharisees in our Lord's day, but we cannot doubt that Jesus had meditated on the scriptures which were interpreted as relating to the subject (such as Hos 6², Dn 12² etc.) for Himself.

In the three main enunciations of the coming Passion experience (Mk 8³¹ 9³¹ 10³⁴) was to be discovered the foreshining of the glory that was to be His in Messianic dignity in the tidings that the third day He would be raised up by the Father's power, or in the Marcan terms, after three days rise again. Such was the half-apprehended lesson for the dazed apostles from the vision of the Transfiguration, if this be located rightly in the Gospel narratives. Such also was the

teaching reflected in the Lucan angelic retrospect spoken to the women at the tomb. Yet in that reported command of silence on the descent from the mountain, when no gloom of suffering dimmed the revealed glory, we are told that "he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead" (Mk 9⁹); to which the author appends a note that they "questioned among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean." Matthew has virtually the same: "Tell the vision to no man, until . . . be raised from the dead" (17⁹). It is noteworthy that here alone is the resurrection said to be *ἐκ νεκρῶν* (cf. Mt 28⁷). Luke emphasises the silence "in those days" of those who saw the vision, but does not report the injunction or the limit enjoined (9^{38b}). There does not seem any obvious reason why he should have suppressed the instruction for secrecy if he found it in his Marcan source, although the motive for the omission from a book for Gentile readers of the discussion about Elijah's advent can well be realised.

It is likely enough that the vision, if confirmatory of the fact which the apostles had confessed in the person of Peter, was not understood until the full light of the appearances of the risen Lord illuminated the meaning of the event for them, and that the reason for the silence—if the command itself be authentic—received its present phrasing at a later time.

In passing in the course of this section from the

three references to future manifestation which are derived from the Marcan record to those (two?) which appear to go back to the primitive collection of sayings of our Lord, the reader can hardly fail to have noticed that the terms of the latter are eschatologically less full and less precise.

C. THE DAY (PAROUSIA) OF THE SON OF MAN

It now falls to us to consider a brief series of occurrences of the title Son of man in an apocalyptic passage which apparently is to be ascribed to Q, but has undergone rearrangement, editing and independent placing in the schemes of the first and third Gospels respectively; and neither expression, "day (days)" or "parousia of the Son of man," is used elsewhere. After the cure of the ten lepers, Luke supplies a motive for the collection of eschatological sayings by a question from the Pharisees as to the immediacy of the Kingdom, which our Lord seems to have answered in a way which teaches that observation is useless, for the coming will be not local but everywhere, and in a moment (17^{20f.}, cf. p. 35). Then follows the unparalleled and at first sight contradictory utterance: "And he said unto the disciples, (The) days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it" (²², which really corresponds with ²⁰). The following verse (²³) takes up the "lo, here! or there!" of that preceding (²¹). We note, however, that in this difficult reputed saying even the desire to

see (contrast 10^{23f.}) is thrown into the future ; and that this special warning as to "one of the days" expected but not experienced is addressed to the disciples, not to the questioners. Does it mean that here and here only, Luke, despite the context, interprets the Kingdom like his master St. Paul (*e.g.* Ro 14¹⁷) as a present, internal and spiritual reality, and therefore no outward sign or catastrophic manifestation thereof is to be expected? The subsequent figures as well as the verses preceding (^{20f.}) seem to exclude this. Unless it be a saying detached from its context which has been inserted at this point in the collection, we appear to be led to conclude that a warning to the disciples from the lips of the Master has been incorporated at the cost of the original connexion to act as a corrective for an undesirable anxiety as to the time of the Lord's coming at the period of the compilation of the Gospel. Unallayed excitement of this sort manifested itself, we know well, both before and after that age (*e.g.* 2 Th 2^{1ff.}, 2 P 3^{4ff.}).

Further, there is not only a total absence of such teaching directed against calculation concerning and desire for the advent of the Kingdom or of the Son of man in the more eschatological Mark, but the previous and subsequent verses appear in the Matthean parallel in the apocalyptic chapter definitely applied to "the Christ," showing that His glorious return was already interpreted as equivalent to the coming of the Kingdom in the more primitive form of the transmission

(24^{23, 26}, a warning about false christs intervening). Then the two evangelists agree in the report of the comparison with the lightning in the ensuing verse, though not quite verbally; but the *tertium comparationis* is obviously the lack of immediate or observable premonition of a sudden and everywhere visible event: "so shall the Son of man be in his day" concludes Luke (24; cf. Ap Ez 13⁵²). But the last three words are omitted by BD, etc., and the readings vary: possibly syr. sin. "so shall the day of . . . be" is nearest to the original, for Matthew has "so shall be the parousia of the Son of man" (27).

After this we have a quite unexpected insertion in Luke alone concerning the present earthly career of the Son of man: "But first he must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation" (25). Here two aspects of the Passion predictions are emphasised, the necessity and the rejection (cf. Mk 8³¹ ||), and also the immediate prospect of their fulfilment. Such an interjected reference to the approaching personal humiliation in the midst of a series of teachings about the glorious manifestation of the apocalyptic figure identified with Himself would be out of place and improbable. It would seem to be best accounted for as an explanatory addition in retelling such utterances during primitive Christian instruction. Now we have illustrations of suddenness and popular indifference supplied from Jewish history, and here our two authors are again agreed, at least in the Noachic reference,

where the one reads: "so shall it be also in the days of" ⁽²⁶⁾, and the other has: "so shall be the parousia of the Son of man" ⁽³⁷⁾. It is quite likely that the illustration from the narrative of Lot is an authentic parallel, and that Matthew has condensed. Luke rounds off the allusion with the words: "after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed" ⁽³⁰⁾, while Matthew has (after words similar to those in Luke descriptive of the experience of the generation of the Flood) a redundant close by means of another formal "so shall be the parousia of the Son of man" ^(39b). The utterances which Luke appends here indicating that the suddenness will be so great as to prohibit return for personal belongings, and as to cause the immediate separation for the Kingdom or otherwise of companions in daily toil ^(31ff.), appear in quite different positions in the series according to Matthew's order ^(17f. 40f.). There is no real difficulty in the divergent expressions used in these separate groupings of authentic sayings of Jesus, for the meaning is the same. The Lucan form in this case we might call more Hebraic, the Matthean more Hellenistic, and a turn of phrase more likely to be used in a cosmopolitan centre such as Antioch. It will be recalled that the only other time that *παρουσία* is so used in the Gospels is at the opening of this same chapter in Matthew about "the last things," where the question which stirred the primitive Christian communities is placed by him alone in the mouth

of "the disciples" on the Mount of Olives: "tell us, when shall these things be, and what (shall be) the sign of thy parousia and of the consummation of the age?" (24³). Wherein we remark also the inclusion of another expression which is peculiar to the first evangelist and possibly reflects the terminology of his circle. Indeed, the presence, the visit from the heavenly sphere in royal majesty, is more in keeping with the spirit of our Lord's teaching concerning Himself than the popular language about His return, because in the full sense as the Messiah, as the heavenly Son of man, He has never yet come (at least in the manner of primitive expectation); and it therefore preserves accurately the correct distinction from His earthly incarnation as virtually Messiah-designate: a distinction blurred indeed in the transmission of the records, but one which it is at any rate extremely probable that He was careful to observe Himself. The person that would be manifested upon the earth as Son of man, and as Messiah, was one and the same—none other than Himself. That was His supreme confidence, the secret of the intimate Sonship of which He was conscious. But it was only under the transformed conditions of the new age, the direct and open sovereignty of God, the Kingdom of the heavens, that His coming, His presence, His day, could really be said to begin; for then alone would His prerogatives, office and functions be completely revealed and exercised as the Father's viceroy in the dominion of the elect, the new Israel.

CHAPTER IV

THE SON OF MAN (*continued*)

D. THE ASCRIPTION OF JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS

(a) *Directly*

THE passages which we have surveyed in connexion with the use of the term Son of man, whether from triple or double transmission, have dealt with the coming of that heavenly being in the future, but have not afforded any definite light upon the functions which He would exercise. This is, however, supplied with regard to one prerogative specially, that of judgement—or more accurately the pronouncement of sentence, by a series of references belonging almost exclusively to the Matthean transmission of Gospel traditions. We must examine each instance without prejudice, but this peculiar limitation of the references naturally stimulates the inquiry as to the reason why the other records betray no clear knowledge of such definite declarations concerning the future office of Jesus in His capacity as Son of man. Let us review these reported utterances in the order in which they occur in the first Gospel.

1. The chapter (13) wherein Matthew groups a collection of parables of the Kingdom opens with that of the Sower, followed by an interpretation thereof; then that of the Tares, which has a family likeness to the Marcan similitude of the Seed growing of itself (4^{26ff.}); next the smaller parables of growth, the Mustard and the Leaven; and then, in response to the disciples' especial request, the clear elucidation (διασάφησον) in the manner of a precise allegorical explanation of the said story of "the tares of the field." The sower is equated with "the Son of man," the field with "the world," the good crop (σπέρμα) with "the sons of the kingdom," the tares with "the sons of the evil (one)," the darnel-sower with "the devil," the harvest with "the consummation of the age," the reapers with "the angels" (37^{ff.}). Then ensues a further eschatological development suggested by the customs of the farm. "As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire, so shall it be in the consummation of the age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels (certainly more than human messengers, as in Lk 9⁵² 7²⁴), and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and the doers of lawlessness (πάντα . . . καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας), and shall cast them into the furnace of fire," etc. (40^{ff.}). Thus in a moment we seem to have passed into the crude and fierce imagery of Jewish apocalyptic thought, which bloomed afresh in the popular eschatological speculation both of Christianity

and of Islam. We feel instinctively that this interpretation can hardly have emanated from Jesus. The Son of man here is a figure of the present and of the past, whose supreme act is depicted as being future (37. 41); the interpreter speaks of Jesus who taught on earth and will come as Lord and Judge (cf. En 62^{2ff.} 69²⁷; and the partially spiritualised interpretation of the Son's judgement, Ap Ez 13³⁸). Moreover, not only is this explanation widely separated, as we have seen, from the parable which it attempts to interpret, but it is inconsistent therewith. For supposing that the story as retold represents in the main the words of Jesus, its aim seems to have been to assist the disciples in accounting for a present mixture among His adherents, somewhat as the Sower narrative sought to solve a similar problem relative to the diverse characters of His hearers, and implicitly precluding—like the Marcan parable (4^{26ff.})—interference with spontaneous development after due preparation. But in this explanation the whole emphasis is on the future. The Son of man, and not God, is central, and is the eschatological agent, having His own angel ministrants and His own kingdom.

The allegorical treatment may rather reflect the state of Christian communities in the compiler's time, and exhibit traces of an ecclesiastical policy, suggested by the evident prominence and insistence of this question in the young Church—what is to be done with the undesirable elements in our midst? for the sons of the

evil one are represented as being within the Kingdom. And the answer would appear to be that of the more comprehensive party: leave them (as in the case also of the inedible fish in the similitude of the Net, ^{47ff.}) to the judicial activity of the Son of man—the returning Lord—when He shall come in His Kingdom, rather than have recourse to the rival policy of exclusion (cf. 2 Jn ¹⁰, 3 Jn ⁸).

There seems to be no solution of present difficulties for the disciples or for a wider range of hearers in the explanation which we possess, it rather manifests the views current in the circle of the compiler.

The position too excites suspicion, so far separated from the parable which it sets out to explain. Even the interpretation of the small figure of the Draw-net follows it immediately. To the author or authors of this explanation the Kingdom and the Church are in some sense already identified: the Church is the present manifestation of the Kingdom, and the Son of man is its Lord, who will, when He comes, both pronounce sentence and execute judgement through His angels. We must remember that Luke offers no parables like these, nor does he seem to have known the related Marcan story; but if Mark's parable represents an earlier and more reliable form, we realise that the initial lesson was that the advent of the Kingdom would be as it were automatic after the preparation of earthly conditions had been duly executed, a period exactly fitting the needful development and known to God alone intervening.

2. Next we have the unique addition to the first utterance concerning the glory of the Son of man (Mk 8³⁸ ||). Not only are the angels "his," but we are told: "then shall he render to every man according to his doing" (Mt 16^{27b}). We are compelled to ask, would such a declaration with its obviously personal claim just after the epoch-making confession by St. Peter have passed unnoticed by the other evangelists? The Psalmist's words (62¹²) about Yahweh are applied directly in an eschatological sense to the Son of man (cf. En 63⁹), the glorified Jesus; and we cannot fail to remark the similarity with what was pictured at the close of the interpretation of the parable of the Tares.

Although we are well aware that a Messianic judgement at the opening of the Kingdom was expected in the Psalms of the Pharisees, and that "the son of a Pharisee" was reported to have named it as being executed upon the inhabited world by Jesus in his speech at Athens (Ac 17³¹), as well as taught it in his letters; although the Similitudes of Enoch describe the Son of man's activities as final Judge, in co-session with God, we are convinced that the fact that there is elsewhere in the Gospel traditions (save Mt 25³¹) no trace of any emphasis on the claim to be adjudicator or even pronouncer of sentence either with respect to the Jews alone or for all mankind is of sufficient importance to compel attention.

If we are told that these prerogatives were naturally assumed by Jesus to belong to the Messiah, then we

must point to the fact that only a portion of the apocalyptic literature of Judaism presupposes them, and we should at least expect some clear indication of the personal claim of our Lord to exercise these functions at the glorious manifestation of the Son of man when the Kingdom of God should come. The stress on the judicial features of His appearing seems to belong to the reflexion of the Jewish-Christian Church, rather than to open declarations of the Master; unless we can account for the curious distribution of the transmitted evidence in some more satisfactory way. We have already had cause to note (p. 122 ff.) that in the passage concerning confession or denial of the Son of man, which is so closely related to the one to which this judgement addition is attached by Matthew, He provides before God the evidence which proves decisive; that is, His office is conceived rather as that of witnessing than as that of pronouncing final sentence. Yet even in this instance we observed that it is only the Lucan form (12⁸) which has the term Son of man, while the first personal pronoun is found in Matthew (10^{32f.}).

3. Once again we have a peculiar touch in the mark of time inserted by Matthew into the utterance about the reward for the apostolic abandonment of earthly ties consisting in dominion over the "twelve tribes of Israel" of the glorious time to come (cf. Ap Ez 13^{39f.}). "Ye that have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory

(cf. En 45³ 55⁴ 62^{3. 5}), ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (19²⁸). When we examine the context, we discover that in the preceding verses concerning the difficulty for the rich to enter the Kingdom and the exclamation of Peter about leaving all, Matthew has followed Mark closely (10²³⁻²⁸); then he introduces from some form of tradition which incorporated it (possibly Q) a saying about thrones (28); and opens it with a Petrine question, implied it may be but unasked according to Mark: "what then shall we have?" (27^c). He resumes Mark's narrative, however, in the very next verse (29) with the promise, "everyone that hath left," etc., only inserting the "and" which had become necessary because of the interruption. Luke inserts nothing in his parallel passage to Mark (18^{28f.}), but locates his form of the "thrones" utterance—associated with feasting in the Kingdom of Jesus (30^a)—after the contention about greatness subsequent to the Last Supper and the teaching which that elicited on humble service, and it is followed by the saying about the sifting of the apostles (22^{28ff.}). It is evident that the saying as regards thrones really suits neither position, and neither transmission justifies itself as truly representing the original words.

The time-definition in Matthew, "in the regeneration," introducing the session of the Son of man "on the throne of his glory" is a later development, necessitating "also" for the apostles, if only because the judgement

prerogative is at the most inferential in the Lucan stage of transmission. Should the matter belong to Q, here only is Jesus represented therein as Judge. The word used (*παλιγγενεσία*) betrays the mind of Greek-thinking Jews as the channel through which the saying has reached its present form, and Semitic speech could only paraphrase it. In the other recension traits peculiar to Luke are manifest; the "temptations" of Jesus recalling the departure of the devil "for a season" (4¹³) and suggesting the sharing of them through persecution, and the Pauline term for "appointing" (*διατίθεμαι*) of dominion, which is unique in the Gospels. We may contrast the promise of "life" (Mk 10³⁰ ||) as the reward "in the age to come," whether the latter phrase were used by our Lord or not (cf. p. 222).

4. It is possible that the peculiar Matthean interpolation in the "little apocalypse" matter: "And then shall the sign of the Son of man appear in heaven" (24^{30a}) may have reference to the majestic manifestation for the exercise especially of judicial functions (in our restricted sense), but that is not necessary. "The sign," as we have seen (p. 125), attaches the verse to the opening inquiry of the disciples as recorded in this Gospel only (3).

In this case the Son of man's presence is the sign; for it cannot be anything anticipatory, because of the close of the verse, "they shall see the Son of man" (as also the parallels), and in that His coming is coincident with the bringing of the Kingdom, the ushering in of the new age and the divine act of judgement. Should some

special sign, however, be mysteriously indicated, it must be a current expectation to which we have lost the clue.

5. The phrase about the session of the Son of man "on the throne of his glory" we left without further remark in an earlier instance (19²⁸), because we should meet with it again and in fuller detail. In the dramatic picture of the Judgement which forms the solemn and terrible conclusion to Matthew's closing group of eschatological parables, we have these as the opening words: "But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another" (25^{31f.}; cf. En 63¹¹ 69²⁷, Ap Ez 13^{23ff.}). The title of the separator and pronouncer of sentence soon changes to "the king" (34. 40), which, as far as we know, Jesus never called Himself; although indeed the cry acclaiming the Davidic king was taken up by the crowds on the occasion of the entry, if Luke's version may be trusted (19³⁸). It is not needful or fitting to discuss here the complex problem of the apparently blended material of this passage; but these introductory verses only strengthen the suspicion aroused by the previous allusion to a judicial session, that the transmission before it has reached the form in which it has come down to us in the first Gospel has been deeply influenced by the teaching of the Similitudes of Enoch concerning the functions of the Elect

one, the Son of man (esp. 62^{5.3} in this instance; and cf. Messiah's enthronement beside God, Chagigah 14^a), and that such influence has been after the authentic words of Jesus began to be retold, else we should expect the other streams of transmission to have exhibited the same traits.

It would appear to be difficult to escape the conclusion that the peculiarities of the Matthean tradition in this respect arise from interpretative study or reminiscence of the Enochic work by Jewish-Christians, with the result that as in the Pauline writings functions of judgeship in relation to the glorified Jesus as Son of man are brought out—to say the least—with much greater clearness than the other records of the words of our Lord would seem to justify.

6. In the third Gospel, besides "the day (days) of the Son of man" (17^{24.30.22.26}; the occurrence of which expressions has already received comment, p. 144 ff.), a terminology which recalls the implications of judgment in the OT "day of Yahweh," there is only one additional clause which involves the ascription of judicial authority to the Son of man. It is found at the close of the eschatological chapter. After the parable of the Fig-tree (as in the other Gospels), teaching the proximity of the Kingdom and the accomplishing of "all things" in that generation, we have a stern warning lest "that day" come on the disciples unawares, and the exhortation ends: "But watch ye (ἀγρυπνεῖτε) at every season, making suppli-

cation, that ye may prevail (*κατισχύσητε*, later MSS. *καταξιώθητε*, cf. 20³⁵) to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand (*σταθῆναι*, *v.l.* *στήσεσθε*) before the Son of man" (21³⁶). There is a Pauline flavour in the language and the teaching here (cf. 2 Co 5¹⁰): the judgement also is evidently conceived as individual.

The standing before the Son's judgement-seat may be either for condemnation or as one of the honoured elect (according to En 62^{3.8}): the latter seems to be implied here, signifying the final vindication of Christians. The last clause, if not the whole verse, has the appearance of an editorial conclusion, reflecting homiletic exhortation of a type different from and later than the Lord's own utterances. It is isolated in the Gospel, and is out of harmony with the warning to watch for the final manifestation which forms the purport of the preceding sentences.

Because of this curious distribution of the passages which have relation to the special judicial prerogatives ascribed to the Son of man in the future we have reversed our usual procedure and left the Marcan source till last. And it is a fact which demands serious considering that the second Gospel contains no open and direct claim to the exercise of what we should term judicial functions on the part of the Son of man in the eschatological sense. An indirect claim might be argued from the final utterance in court (14⁶²), although some—*e.g.* Wellhausen—on inadequate grounds have questioned

its authenticity apart from its merely verbal accuracy. It is open to infer that this use of terms from a psalm regarded as Messianic in interpretation (110¹) would imply a co-session including the exercise of functions of judgement; although it may be doubted whether such would be deemed more than punitive and national in aim, as executed by the Messiah in the rôle of divine Vice-gerent (cf. Mk 13^{26f.} ||).

We have realised too before (p. 124) that the "shame" of the Son of man (8³⁸) can hardly be predicated of one who is the Judge in our meaning of the word, in view of similar passages from the other source, which rather suppose Jesus (Son of man, Lk.) to be the chief witness in the heavenly Judgement-scene. In a similar way the distinct offices of witness and judge are ascribed to Saoshyant (*Yasna* 45, 27).

Thus, but for Lk 13²⁶ in an expanded parabolic passage (to be cited immediately below), we seem to have no grounds for attributing to our Lord the claim to prerogatives of judgement such as the Church came to assume that He made. Or to put it with the utmost terseness: the two most ancient and reliable streams of tradition, Mk. and Q, appear to "know nothing" of any words of our Lord in which He announced that He would be the final Judge. It may have been simply assumed. But all that we can safely say is that the self-identification with the Son of man which the Marcan record attests might be supposed to imply and include judicial activity.

(b) By Applications of the Parables

Because of this somewhat striking phenomenon that the attributing of judicial functions as commonly understood to Jesus as Son of man is virtually confined to the record of the first Gospel, it will not be a profitless digression at this juncture to see if any of the parables which teach preparedness for the Kingdom by means of comparison with a personage returning at some indefinite period imply that the creator of the stories would be Himself the Judge in His capacity of Messiah and Son of man to be.

Although there is a considerable amount of eschatological material in Mark, the few parables recorded by him afford us no direct data for this question. In Luke, however, several parabolic references suggest such a claim in the form in which they have been transmitted, the most obvious being that contained at the close of the simile concerning "the master of the house" (13^{25ff.}). We cannot be sure—and indeed there is no strong reason to suppose—that this section was originally spoken immediately after the indirectly eschatological allusion to the narrow door (²⁴; cf. Mt 7^{13f.}) and suggested thereby; while it was followed by the picture of the in-coming of the dispersed (whether proselytes or, as later interpreted, Gentiles) to recline in the Kingdom of God (^{28f.}). The compiler may have found the various portions of the paragraph thus linked together in his source of the Lord's sayings (Q), because of the association of the ideas of shutting out and casting forth by

the exclusion of just those who felt certain of inclusion (²⁸; cf. Mt 8¹²).

But we cannot fail to remark that, as the action proceeds in Luke, the application affects the form of this veiled parable of the Kingdom, and the agent changes from God to Jesus Himself through the words placed in the mouth of the excluded ones—"Lord . . . We have eaten and drunk before thee, and thou didst teach in our streets." Further, the adverse verdict as attached in the transmission is on another plane than the story, and is eschatologically conceived: "depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity," after the manner which is found in Matthew (13⁴¹ 7²³; cf. Ps 6⁸). There is thus a point of contact provided for the utterance about the ingathering to the Messianic feast—with the sentences in reverse order to that in which they appear in the first Gospel (8^{12f.})—so that the place of exclusion suggested by the contemporary form of the parable becomes the abiding place of the wicked who are tortured (according to a persistent Jewish conception) by gazing upon the joys of the righteous (^{28f.}).

The confession of these men to their own detriment in the closing phase of the story recalls the scene, depicted from another standpoint, of the confessing and denying of men by Jesus (Mt 10^{32f.} ||), where in the Lucan form the agent is named "the Son of man"; but it seems to carry us beyond the (presumably earlier) idea of our Lord's testimony to adherence or rejection, when He is thus represented in the trans-

mitted form of a parable as uttering sentence of separation Himself. We cannot feel that this transformation in the course of a brief similitude belongs at all probably to the original story; unless we are to suppose that these verses constitute a fragment of teaching given in private to the disciples, one of whom is the questioner mentioned in the introductory verse (23). For surely so open a claim to the pronouncement of what would seem to be a final verdict upon men would have been seized on at once as Messianic and more, if uttered as it is here represented in public teaching, "journeying on unto Jerusalem" (22). We are led to conclude that the additional excuse offered to the teaching "Lord," *i.e.* Jesus in His ministry on earth, is due most probably to the later re-touching of an authentic simile, now incompletely preserved, when application came to be made quite naturally in early Christian homiletics to the glorified Lord as the judicial excluder from the Kingdom in His "day." Most likely in the form of the story as it was originally spoken God was represented throughout by the householder; for the point of comparison is the struggle for entrance, the striving for fitness to share in the coming Kingdom.

Again, without entering into the details, we can say that in the related parables of the Talents (Mt 25^{14ff.}) and of the Pounds (Lk 19^{12ff.}) the transmitted stories themselves do not in any way imply that it is the speaker who goes away and returns after a long time; although the Christian retellers of the parables soon

interpreted them of the Lord for whose "return" they ardently longed. Matthew alone by the eschatological turn of his conclusion (³⁰) shows that the exegetical transition is proceeding.

Similarly in the comparisons of faithful waiting (Mt 24^{43ff.}, Lk 12^{40. 42ff.}), while both evangelists take up the reference to the Son of man's coming (⁴⁴, ⁴⁰) from the collection of the Lord's sayings, it is Matthew alone who adds words which point definitely to the attribution of judicial functions having been made already in the course of homiletic interpretation at the time of the compilation of his Gospel (24^{51b}); thus testifying to the fact that he and the Christians presumably of his locality or circle regarded final punishment as having been "committed" to their Lord, the Son of man; although the original language of the parables probably neither demanded nor indeed—in a case like that of the Vineyard story (Mk 12^{1ff.})—permitted of such interpretation.

It is worth noting in this connexion that the simple moral, "Watch," attached to the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, is left untouched (25¹³); whereas the shutting out might have been utilised to teach more openly the Son's right of exclusion, the more so as Jesus was very soon identified with the bridegroom in the story, for so at least He was reported to have spoken of Himself at a much earlier stage in His ministry (Mk 2^{19f. 11}). The fact that it is not thus applied may serve to confirm the originality of the words, "and the bride" in the opening verse of the parable.

These samples are sufficient to show that it is quite inadequate to suppose that Matthew merely corrected omissions and misconceptions in his Marcan source on the one hand, and on the other exhibited—unconsciously, of course—the lack of eschatological precision in Luke, who used in great part but with less purposeful, not to say mechanical, artistry the same discourse material. These touches being not only additional but formal betray a definite tendency. The indirect witness of the parables in this Gospel, taken together with the direct interpretative additions, serve to indicate the way in which primitive exegesis, in localities and communities under the influence of a Jewish-Christian religious atmosphere of an apocalyptic type, was tending towards the ascription to Jesus of an authority to pronounce sentence which He had at least not claimed in any direct manner for Himself. This line of argument seems much stronger than that which suggests the toning down of Jewish colour and the elimination in places of apocalyptic imagery by Mark and Luke as accounting for the phenomena.

Apart from this special aspect of coming for the purpose of judgement which has just had our attention, other portions of our Lord's parabolic teaching lent themselves very easily to an application to the time of His "presence," or—when the manifestation in flesh came to be regarded as the first coming—His "return." For example, several of the stories from life suggest a delay whose length is quite unknown.

In the parable of the Master and his Slave (or Steward, Mt 24^{45ff.}, Lk 12^{42ff.}), which follows upon the warning to be on the alert for the Son of man's coming, the slave if he is bad will say to himself: "my lord delayeth his coming," and will act upon that thought, with the result that the sudden arrival of the master brings the doom of the unfaithful.

Again, the parables of the Talents and of the Pounds imply that the householder, nobleman or king—the agent in different stories of the same type, which have suffered conflation, at least in Luke—returns "after a long time" (Mt.), and then expects to find the efficient administration of his commands and the outcome of devoted service. In this case we should remark that Luke—and quite possibly Q before him—relates definitely his form of the type as being uttered in response to a question as to the immediate appearing of the Kingdom (19¹¹).

Once more, the same motive is observable in the delaying of the bridegroom in the Matthean parable of the Virgins (25⁵), as well as in the kindred but conciser Lucan simile of the slaves awaiting their lord on his return from his marriage (12³⁶).

Now, the original point in all these stories is not the advent, presented in picture-words to the mind, of the speaker, Jesus, as Son of man, as the glorified Lord, but simply the certainty of the divine manifestation and of the divine reckoning in the coming of the Kingdom. It is that which throughout our Lord's teaching is

primary. Although He identified Himself with that Son of man whose appearing would be coincident with that of the glorious rule of God, His own coming is secondary, and indeed there seems to have been no open allusion to it in His public utterances until the final scene at the Jewish trial.

So too with all the parables which inculcate watchfulness and faithfulness, whether the delay was emphasised or not, we may regard it as a fact that the original stories indicated that the future magnitude of the Kingdom some time soon to come filled the horizon of thought for the speaker and the hearers alike. In few words, the application of them to Jesus—above all, the transference in an eschatological sense to Him as the exalted Lord whose return was ardently expected of the activities of vindication or of punishment involved in these stories—is Christian, secondary and interpretative. For the Church, however, His longed-for coming meant indeed that of God's Kingdom in its fulness, and, by implication, judgement in and through the new Israel over which He would reign; while as the time elapsed, consolation would naturally be sought from these parables which could be applied to the delay in the Lord's return, and the form of their transmission probably came in turn to be affected thereby.

E. THE PERSONAL USE OF THE TERM

Thus far the passages have been set forth wherein our Lord used or has been reported to have used

the title Son of man as a designation for the apocalyptic personage of the future with whom He came to identify Himself, as they occurred in connexion with the predictions of the Passion and of coming in glory after resurrection, which was associated—according to part of the transmission—with the exercise of prerogatives of judgement, national or universal. It falls to us now to consider those references where the first and third Gospels on the basis of the common discourse-source, or one of them apparently without any such foundation, utilise or introduce the term in question with an evidently personal connotation; that is, using it undoubtedly as a substitute for the first personal pronoun in words attributed to Jesus.

Some of these references in their present positions in the narratives would imply that the designation was used—without any explanation being afforded—before the time of the great confession near Cæsarea.

1. Within the nucleus of the discourse material gathered together in the Sermon on the mountain (or the level place) we have in each record an expanded benediction of the persecuted, which is exhibited in divergent recensions. The eighth beatitude in Matthew's version reads: "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens"; and then it is repeated and extended: "Blessed are ye when (men) shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake" (5^{10f.}).

In Luke the fourth benediction runs: "Blessed

are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate-you-from-their-company (ἀφορίσωσιν), and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake" (ἐν ἐμοί, 6²²). It is hardly likely that either of these forms represents an authentic report of actual words. Apart from the difficulty of reproducing in translation the Aramaic brevity and balance of these aphoristic sayings in the Sermon, the tense variations and other features in this case are secondary and betray the influence of primitive Christian experience. Unless we are to suppose that our Lord was referring to prophets of old, the perfect (Mt.) has no justification; for there is no trace of any persecution of the adherents of Jesus at this stage or indeed at all during the ministry—at least according to the Synoptists; contrast Jn 9²²—so that the conflicts with orthodox Judaism after Pentecost appear to have influenced this form of transmission.

Furthermore, the title in question is applied by Luke in a way which shows that it has become a proper name equivalent to the personal pronoun on the lips of Jesus; for there is no hint in all the Sermon material in either Gospel otherwise that such designation was then publicly used by Jesus of Himself. On the contrary, one of the chief traits of independent majesty in these transforming utterances is just their being spoken directly with the simple authority of the first person.

There is every reason to think that the "for my sake" (supposing the form of the expansion itself to be

authentic, although the readings vary) of Mt 5¹¹ would be closest to the original; because Jesus would be speaking of Himself, and not of the functions of any mysterious apocalyptic personage: nor have we any evidence that at this presumably early stage our Lord made use of the title as equivalent to Himself even in private converse with the disciples. Otherwise there seems to be little doubt that Matthew's recension reflects a later situation, while Luke's own style and language are evident in the fuller report which he gives. It appears to be virtually certain here that the substitution of the title bears witness to an early and quite temporary usage of it as a name for the Lord, and contributes nothing to our knowledge of the outlook of Jesus during the ministry.

2. The next occasion of the use of the term is in a narrative which seems to belong to Q, when Jesus, after the rebuke of those dissatisfied with Him by means of the simile of the discontented children at play in the market-place, contrasts the mode of the Baptist's coming in imitation of the solitariness and asceticism of prophets of old with the social courtesies which He practised among all classes: "The Son of man is come (came, Mt.) eating and drinking: and ye (they, Mt.) say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (Mt 11¹⁹, Lk 7³⁴). Assuming the authenticity of the words, two things are evident here. First, that our Lord is using purposely a delicate circumlocution for the personal pronoun, and that with

no allusion to future majesty but to present conditions of life. Some objected to John's exclusiveness, others to the unorthodox catholicity of Jesus. In the vernacular, of course, the term would be indefinite, "a man," "somebody," although there could be no doubt that He was really indicating Himself, as He had probably overheard or been told by the disciples the remarks popularly passed on the contrast between the one who began and the Prophet of Nazareth who took up and developed the cry of the coming Kingdom.

Secondly, the saying is more likely to belong to a comparatively late period in the ministry, when the distinction between gloomy solitude and sympathetic and unfettered intercourse had come to be commonly remarked.

It must be quite understood that there is no place here for the implication of a heavenly being or of approaching majesty. The definiteness of the title belongs to the Greek translation, and the changes noted in Matthew's transmission betray the fact that the expression had become an accepted title for Jesus, the heavenly Lord, even with reference to His earthly career.

3. The next time that we meet with the self-designation in the dual tradition from the ancient discourse element is in that remarkable passage, when, after the repudiation by the authorities of the Lord's works of mercy as due to the assistance of the powers of evil, He reproaches the "evil generation" for seeking a sign (through "certain of the scribes and Pharisees,"

Mt 12³⁸; cf., in the variant account derived from Mk., "the Pharisees and Sadducees . . . tempting," 16¹). The message of Jesus has been indeed a sign all-sufficient for the revealing of His mission and for preparing men for the Kingdom that is at hand; but they—as He confesses with evident human agony of soul—have rejected it with wilful deafness. He reflects as it were aloud on the suicidal conduct of those stimulated by the religious leaders: "there shall no sign be given to it (the contemporary generation) but the sign of Jonah," and the same reply was made to the sign-seekers in the doublet (16⁴) from the Marcan source, although according to the latter—without any illustrations from history—the refusal of a sign was unqualified (8¹²). The collection of the Lord's sayings appears to have continued in a manner which afforded or suggested the reason which Luke gives: "For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation" (11³⁰). Then we have the examples from the nation's story of those who were far from indifferent to preaching and teaching. The queen of the south was religiously affected (so it seems to have been traditionally inferred) by Solomon's wisdom, which she travelled so far to hear: thus she will condemn this generation for their failure to accept the doctrine of Jesus and find salvation through penitence, because "something greater (πλεϊον) than Solomon is here." Likewise the men of Nineveh, for they according to the familiar story repented and

found safety for their city in accepting the prophet's preaching, "and behold, something greater than Jonah is here" (31f.). If these two sayings were immediately consecutive in Q, the Matthean order attaching the warning from the Ninevites' example to the utterance about the sign of Jonah is likely to be the more original, and to have received what was intended to be a chronological correction afterwards. Otherwise in these verses, but for the omission of "the men of," and the replacing of "it" for "them" in the queen of Sheba reference (12⁴²), Matthew agrees verbally with Luke.

But as in the Lucan recension the verse preceding the historic allusions forms a problem by itself. With regard to that which constituted "the sign of Jonah," Matthew offers quite a different explanation. "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (12⁴⁰): as if it were a direct prediction of death, burial and descent into Sheol, and that announced publicly, without effect on or comment from the hearers.

The conviction that this verse arose from reflexion in Jewish-Christian surroundings as to wherein the sign of which Jesus spoke consisted appears to be insurmountable. It may, indeed, belong to the original Gospel-text, it may be very ancient; but the context in which the historic signs adduced are associated with preaching or teaching compels us to regard it as non-authentic. The Ninevites did not reject and slay Jonah; but they

did repent, and so, as the story told, save their generation: that is the point. And that point is not obscured by the Lucan form; only the significance of the contrasted rejection of Jesus and His message by "this generation" is placed in the future.

Even if our Lord used any such words as the intermediate verse in Matthew supposes, we should still have to remark that no future activity in divine power on the speaker's part is implied in the utterance, nor do the historic parallels immediately adduced suggest it. The title is evidently personal as it stands; but we cannot see what it could convey to the crowd (²⁹), for they would not perceive in the person of the speaker the mysterious heavenly being of apocalyptic speculation.

Assuredly it might be objected that the tremendous claim to be greater than Solomon or Jonah follows without arousing any remark; but that—assuming its authenticity as it is reported in Q—would only represent the burning consciousness of His own inherent dignity as Son, as Revealer and Proclaimer of the Kingdom—unrealised by the people who refused to accept and act upon His proclamation—breaking through His customary reserve in public utterances.

We seem forced to regard as most reasonable the conclusion that we have here in the third and first Gospels respectively two distinct and successive attempts at explaining what was "the sign of Jonah" of which the primitive tradition held that our Lord made mention. Probably it consisted in the fact of pro-

claiming a divinely originated message, such as that which in those historic instances had so different an issue for the hearers.

On this hypothesis Luke would be nearer the true interpretation. But although this episode must belong, as he places it, to a late period in the ministry, the title appears to be best explained here also as a substitute—very early no doubt—for the personal name. If this be correct, we must look upon the verse in either case as a subsequent explanatory comment upon the preceding expression “the sign of Jonah,” and therefore affording us no real assistance for the understanding of the outlook of Jesus.

4. There is another instance of the personal use of the expression in a saying which is widely separated in position in the different accounts. Quite early in the Galilean ministry, after various healings and an instruction to prepare for crossing the lake, Matthew tells of “a scribe” who offers to follow Jesus wherever He goes. And Jesus saith unto him, “The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have lodging places, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head” (8²⁰).

Then follows (21^{f.}), before they embark, the terse rebuke of the dilatoriness and half-heartedness of another would-be disciple.

Luke, however, locates the utterance in the same context of replies to men who aspired to be followers, but relates these at the outset of his “great interpolation” dealing with accumulated material which he

apparently associated with the journey to the Holy City. There is first the proposal of the over-zealous brethren as to the unreceptive Samaritan village, and the consequent rebuke ; and then the narrative proceeds : "As they went in the way a certain man" says that he will follow Jesus. And the reply vouchsafed by our Lord is identical with that in the first Gospel (9⁵⁸). The case of the shrinking disciple ensues, only expressed in stronger terms ; and it is succeeded by that of a third who desires to "look back" in bidding farewell first at home (59^{ff.}). In this Gospel the charge to the "other seventy" follows immediately (10^{1ff.}).

Now, although the two evangelists place this saying so differently in their respective records, not only are the episodes of the context and the utterance itself unlikely to have been imagined at a later time, but there is such pathos in these words of the divine Wanderer that they would abide in the memory ; and further, they are in the utmost harmony with those efforts of Jesus in the immediate context to make men realise the vastness of the sacrifice involved in following Him, and in fitting self and others for the impending Kingdom of God. Apparently this section of samples, as it were, of our Lord's testing of would-be adherents had—as was so often the case—no time-mark in the primitive collection of sayings, and Matthew at any rate thought an occasion of escaping the multitudes a suitable place for their introduction. But although we are ignorant of the actual occasion and of the circumstances,

for the aspirant to whom it was addressed as well as for the hearers there would be no suggestion of heavenly dignity in the saying. Indeed, the expression could only be taken as a self-restrained periphrasis for the first person: "the man," *i.e.* this one, I, the speaker. A contrast between the instinctive habits of animals and the artificial dwelling-places of man in general would have no point. And although the contrast between majesty and humiliation was most likely present to the mind of the evangelists, the original application must have been personal: to follow meant practically to be homeless.

5. The remaining occurrences of the self-designation Son of man in the dual transmission of Matthew and Luke have been considered previously in other connexions (pp. 132 ff., 144 ff.). But there are two instances left of the single transmission of the title. One is peculiar to Matthew, at the critical moment of the Petrine confession (16¹³).

He represents our Lord as making the great inquiry in a form which more than supplies the answer; which is not only highly improbable, but is contradicted by the plain and direct question reported in both the other Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, the words transmitted—themselves a translation—are not handed down with unanimity. "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" (⌘ B, Vss.), against the later type, "that I the Son of man am" (DGL, etc.)? Now to those familiar with the Enoch literature—and we can hardly suppose it to

have been entirely unknown to the fishermen-apostles—the Son of man was the Messiah, the Chosen, and more, because He was a mysterious and majestic heavenly being. But the aim of the repeated inquiry of Jesus was not to obtain their opinion about a title or a figure of apocalyptic speculation, but of Himself: “Who do men (the crowds, Lk.) say that I am?” as Mark (8²⁷) and Luke (9¹⁸) report it quite clearly (cf. Jn 6^{67ff.}). The early tendency, which we have remarked more than once already, to replace the pronoun by the title which had become familiar for Jesus, has been at work here. Early it must have been, because the inadequacy of the Jewish term with its specialised meaning for a world-conquering religion which had taken on by the very influx of disciples Hellenistic features and developments was obvious; and, as far as we know, the representative idea was yet unapplied to the expression. Similarly, the highest title for the patriotic Jew (“Christ”) had to be dropped owing to its national and limited connotation, and gave place to the imperial term (“Lord”), divine alike to the men of Græco-Roman culture and to the Jewish Christians (from LXX associations). Again, we must not lose sight of the possibility of an artistic not to say artificial reason for the insertion in the Matthean form of the narrative at this place: the climax—“men,” “Son of man,” “Son of the living God” (16, in Peter’s expanded reply)—can scarcely be unintentional.

Taking into account the numerous instances where

this term has evidently been introduced afterwards in retelling as a personal title for Jesus, we must regard it as extremely improbable (to say the least) that our Lord made use of such a designation for Himself at a moment when He desired a free and clear expression of the mind of others. And not only this: it appears to be pretty well established by the criticism of the Gospels—and we shall seek to justify it afresh shortly (p. 182 ff.)—that our Lord did not utilise the title in question for Himself even in the privacy of intercourse with His own disciples until after this dividing-line in the Gospel-story.

6. The other case is in the Lucan account of the Betrayal. After the command to the sleeping apostles to rise, we are told that “while” Jesus “yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and he drew near to Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, Judas, with a kiss betrayest thou the Son of man?” (22^{47f.}). It will be remembered that we found (p. 114) in Mark a “deliverance” prediction inserted apparently in the words of the Master just as the behest to arise was uttered, and in which the title was reported to have been used for the personal pronoun (14⁴¹); but no words were given as passing between the Lord and the traitor save his greeting “Rabbi.” Matthew, after narrating similar words as addressed to the apostles in the garden, reports as the greeting of Judas: “Hail, Rabbi,” and gives the further curious response of our Lord: “Com-

rade, (do) that for which thou art come" (*ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*, or, taken as a question, "wherefore art thou come?" 26⁵⁰).

Now it is perfectly natural and explicable that in the terrible excitement and horror of the moment none would grasp every detail sufficiently to be able to tell afterwards with certainty what, if anything, was said by Jesus at the fateful meeting. Yet we must reckon with the possibility of Luke's having obtained from somebody on one side or the other what he conceived to be reliable information as to the words of our Lord on that occasion, as well as with that of a conscious literary readjustment on his part.

Supposing the utterance to be authentic, we might take it to be a final pathetic attempt to reveal to the betrayer the full enormity of the deed by reminding him through the use of the solemn title of the coming majestic dignity of Him whom he was thus treacherously delivering up, recalling both the scene at Cæsarea and the revelation and intimate training which had followed. Of course, if there be any truth in the hypothesis that the betrayal consisted in the revealing to His foes of this very "Messianic secret" (Schweitzer), even the above possible motive falls away. But when all things have been considered, it appears preferable to regard this saying as expressive rather of the utter horror of a later age at the terrible and ungrateful deed; perhaps even with the intention of implying that the actual kiss was not given, seeing that Luke at least does not state that it was so, indeed it may have been his purpose to

heighten the effect by transferring the title associated in Mark with the final prediction of "deliverance" to the moment of the act itself.

If any words were spoken by our Lord at this awful moment, it is, as we have said above, extremely doubtful whether from the excited state of the onlookers they would be accurately heard, or amid the divergences of the traditions would be trustworthily recorded. Whatever be thought of the reliability of the Lucan narrative here in this and other respects, the saying, even if authentic, contributes nothing new to the problem of our Lord's use of the term as a self-designation.

Just as it would be quite permissible to make mention of the last instance in connexion with the use of the title in relation to our Lord's anticipated sufferings, so there are occurrences in that section (*A*), such as Mk 14²¹ || 41 ||, which might be classed among these later references (*E*) which we have called personal, because the speaker is represented as alluding to Himself in His earthly experience. It is well thus to emphasise the fact that hard lines of classification cannot be drawn: the same instances might appear in different groups according to the special standpoint from which they are viewed.

F. MAN AS SUCH

We have to consider in this chapter last of all those passages in the early portion of Mark which are paralleled in the other Synoptists, but in which—assuming that the episodes are rightly placed early in

the ministry—there seems to be little doubt that the expression Son of man, if authentic, must have meant “man,” and had originally nothing to do with the mysterious heavenly being of apocalypse nor with Jesus in that future dignity in respect of which He used the title at a later time to signify Himself.

1. The first instance of the use of the term *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the story of the ministry occurs in the narrative of the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum. In each account the Lord puts forth the question as to which is easier, forgiveness or healing: the words would be heard, but the spiritual result at least would be invisible, while the effectiveness of the healing command would be at once demonstrated.

“But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the paralytic), Arise, take up thy bed,” etc. (Mk 2¹⁰, Mt 9⁶ inserting “then” in the parenthesis, Lk 5²⁴, “he said to the palsied”). If this clause stating the purpose of the action should be an interpolation which arose in Christian retelling, of course the title would have its fuller value as a synonym for Jesus, as it doubtless had for the evangelists. It is important, however, for the discovering of the original implication of the story to notice the various forms of concluding it. Mark has: “insomuch that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion” (12^b)—no suggestion of any extraordinary claim, only the impression made by the healing. Matthew reads: “But when the crowds

saw it, they feared, and glorified God, who had given such authority unto men" (8)—obviously implying the divine power to declare forgiveness and in doing so to effect a cure. Luke only emphasises the wonder of the onlookers: "And amazement took hold on all, and they glorified God; and they were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things (*εἶδομεν παράδοξα*) to-day" (26). This event appears to have its place among the foremost in the primitive narrative of the acts of Jesus, because it is the first startling public cure to be recorded with "scribes" present. Now it is only natural to expect that our Lord, under the limitations of revelation through humanity, shared the common Jewish belief that physical ailments were due to sin, and so the declaration of forgiveness would be the best preparation for the restoration of bodily well-being. Yet although, according to the prophetic conception, the Messiah would work bodily cures, there is nothing to show after this event that any Messianic or divine claim was regarded as having been involved in any such declaration on God's behalf. To eliminate the forgiveness part of the narrative does not help us, for what would suggest its invention afterwards? Indeed, the whole point of the story seems originally to have been that one who was a man forgave and healed; that man possessed such power was the previously unappreciated fact, as all the conclusions though verbally differentiated manifest. If Jesus did Himself use the term here, the context leads us to believe that He simply meant man, and so inclusively

and especially Himself as peculiarly conscious of that God-given authority through His unique Sonship-experience. But even then at the time of Gospel-writing it would be regarded as a title for Jesus with richer meaning, and this is also suggested by the contrast implied in the words "on earth."

It is possible, as we have said, that the telic sentence may be an explanation which had become fixed in early preaching and embedded in the written story, as it was the first occasion wherein Jesus was recorded as declaring the forgiveness of sins to the patients whom He healed.

For this the difficulty of the present tense ("hath authority") would not be insuperable. At any rate, no outward Messianic import seems to have been originally possible, although forgiveness was an expected function on the spiritual side; nor is there any sign of such having been understood by those present, and this harmonises with the total silence of the records—fragmentary though they admittedly are—of the public ministry in this respect up to its very close. That the whole emphasis of the story as we have it is on the authority to forgive may be regarded as receiving corroboration from the declaratory forgiveness in other cases (*e.g.* Lk 7^{47f.}), and more indirectly from the frequent teaching in private and by parable that human forgiving of fellow-men was a necessary precondition for the divine pardon.

2. The episode in the cornlands supplies the next

instance of the usage of the title as an equivalent for man in general. After justifying His disciples' action by an illustration from the life of Israel's hero-king, the Lord is represented as adding the broad principle: "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath (ὁ ἄνθρωπος): so that (ὥστε) the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath" (Mk 2^{27f.}). The text as it stands would imply that there is a distinction *a fortiori* drawn between man and Jesus under the familiar title; but in the original conversation such would be quite pointless.

Matthew in his account of the event represents Jesus as adding a further illustration from the unblamed ceremonial toil of the priests on Sabbath-days, with a remarkable asseveration at the close, which reminds us of the comparison of Himself with Solomon and Jonah (p. 172 ff.): "but I say unto you, that something greater (μεῖζον) than the temple is here"—a fit subject for a blasphemy charge like that which figures prominently in the final trial scene; for such an one surely could annul the Law as represented in the traditional Sabbath injunctions. Then follows the rebuke of the legalistic complainants for "condemning the guiltless" through not understanding (in Hosea's phrase, 6⁶) that mercy is more desirable than sacrifice, the spirit than the letter. Only at this juncture is the reason appended; "for the Son of man is lord of the sabbath" (12⁸), thus teaching plainly that man is master, in that the observance of the day is to be subservient to his best interests.

Luke also does not report the significant saying about the Sabbath being made for man, and merely adds to the question about the Davidic episode: "and he said unto them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath" (6⁵). It seems hard to avoid the conclusion that at the time of compilation in all cases the Greek form of words was taken to be a title for Jesus. But even though the episode may not be rightly placed so early as the position in Mark suggests, it would be out of the question to assume here any self-identification with the heavenly personage of apocalyptic speculation, just as much as it would be to suppose any Messianic prerogatives to be implied. For the very pivot of the Master's defence, assuming Mk²⁷ to be authentic, whether belonging actually to this occasion or not, is the assertion of the purely human right to dispense with ceremonial regulations in case of need involving men's physical welfare. This is the attitude exhibited in all our Lord's healings, spiritual and bodily, on the Sabbath days.

Naturally the speaker is included in "man," but the later stories of (to the strictly orthodox) His Sabbath-breaking and of His trenchant criticism of traditional Sabbath restrictions have had their quite accountable influence on the minds of the writers or transmitters of this narrative; and so they have interpreted the episode as betokening a declaration of the Lord's special authority as the heavenly Son of man on earth to rescind the inferential Sabbath laws of Judaism.

Thus from motives of reverence, working it may be unconsciously, the thought of the dignity and authority of the Master has come to counterbalance and then to displace the true heart of the story, which lies in that saying so forceful and so far-reaching in principle, that man is greater than the Sabbath: religious observance is his servant not his master. The plea that Jesus spoke here as ideal or representative man does not need any discussion, for it is not only quite apart from the teaching of the episode, but the conception itself appears to have had no place in the world of contemporary Palestinian thought. It is at least possible to argue that the *ὥστε* clause in Mark is the inferential and later judgement of Christians on the basis of an insertion (because D, etc. om. ²⁷, and syr. sin. the last clause) in the teeth of the Jewish opponents who deemed their Lord a law-breaker. In that case the term would have from the first the fuller significance which had become current. The human view (so to speak) taken above of the original sense of the words as they stand in the transmitted narratives does not touch the question of our Lord's personal but probably still private consciousness of Messianic Sonship.

3. The third passage which has been reserved for treatment until now might have been expected to receive consideration among the instances of the occurrence of the title as a synonym for Jesus in the dual tradition; but it will be realised that this usage and the interpretation which it involves are evidently

secondary. In this difficult utterance concerning "blasphemy" as it is reported in our Mark, we have attributed as the occasion thereof the arrival of "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem" with the accusation—which was designed to counteract the impression made by His works of healing—that such cures were accomplished through collusion with "the prince of the demons" (3²²); the whole section (22-30) having been apparently introduced as illustrating the official view, as it were, of a situation which "his friends" regarded as being due to our Lord's being "beside himself" (21), such being the assumed fact which affords the point of contact between the two stories.

Jesus is then represented as refuting His detractors by an *argumentum ad hominem* with analogies derived from the fate of a divided Satan, and further enforced by the mental picture of the victory of the stronger. Hereupon the twofold utterance about forgiveness of sins or of blasphemy directed against man or God is attached; applicable indeed thereto, but apparently without any original connexion with the preceding mode of defence on the part of Jesus: "Verily I say unto you, that all things shall be forgiven unto the sons of men (τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων; as in LXX, e.g. Ps 106⁸)—the sins and the blasphemies—whatsoever (πάντα . . . ὅσα) they shall blaspheme: but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath not forgiveness for ever, but is guilty of an eternal (αἰωνίου) sin" (28f.).

The linguistic form may not be very lucid, but the real contrast is quite obvious, between the offences (slandorous though they may be) of men against their fellows—which can be and ought to be forgiven—and deliberate refusal to appreciate the beneficent effects of the operation of the divine Spirit upon their afflicted brethren through human instrumentality—an attitude wholly to be condemned. The argument involves a series of curative works or exorcisms, or at least one, such as supplies (Mt 12²², Lk 11¹⁴) the reason for the discussion.

Probably the literal translation of the original current Aramaic expression (בר (א) נשא) was or should have been in the singular, but the term any way was generic in significance—"man," not "the man."

Naturally a distinction between "the Son of man" metaphysically or apocalyptically conceived and "the Holy Spirit" as God in operation would have been pointless, unintelligible and wholly anachronistic. For here, accepting the saying as belonging to this or a similar "apology" for His acts of mercy, Jesus is arguing openly and clearly with orthodox opponents who are using unworthy methods in order to undermine His fame as a healer and exorcist. But that the transformation by re-interpreting the words from a purely Christian standpoint had already been wrought in or during the transmission of the common source is shown by the fact of its being thus represented in different recensions in different positions in the other

Synoptists. If this had taken place before the compilation of Mark, the plural would be an early error, but Mt 12⁸¹ renders that unlikely.

Matthew, in the same context as Mark, but with the healing of one blind and dumb for occasion (to which the previous cure of a dumb man and the subsequent collusion charge, which however D, syr. sin., etc. omit, seem but a doublet, 9^{32ff.}; cf. Lk 11^{14f.}) affords similar illustrations during the argument—but adding the case of a city (12²⁵) and the acknowledgment of successful exorcisms on the opponent's side (27), together with the statement that the very fact of His cures is a token of the Kingdom's present power (28), and that he that is not with Jesus is really against Him (30).

Then he works over the Marcan version of our saying as follows: "Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις); but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man (κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, nor in the coming one" (31f.). The latter verse which Matthew conjoins is of a secondary and interpretative type; yet perhaps to the collector of Q, as well as to the evangelists who make use of it, the saying had already come to signify that it is *the* Son of man (*sc.* Jesus) who forgives the slanders of His foes; but there is no pardon whatever for the

wilful repudiating of the divine operation. The growing reverence for the person of the Lord would exclude the possibility of the invention of such a saying later.

Luke places the utterance in question within the material of "the great interpolation" in a sequence of sayings unlikely to have been spoken connectedly. There are those dealing with divine care through possibly violent death, illustrated by God's knowledge of the sparrows' fall (12^{4ff.}); followed by the contrast of the blessedness of confessing the Son of man and the doom consequent on denying Him (8^{f.}); and this replacing, if it be so, of the personal pronoun (Mt 10³², *κύριώ*) by the title serves to link the saying with that which we are considering, and which appears as follows: "And every one who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven" (10). This mention of the Spirit seems to constitute the point of contact for the ensuing saying in the series which Luke records, about the promise of the Holy Spirit's teaching in the hour of the disciples' defence before human tribunals (11^{f.}).

In the third Gospel the collusion charge and the answer to it appear earlier (11^{15ff.}), associated with the same miracle as we found in Matthew, but differently introduced ("some of" the crowd, Lk.; "the Pharisees," Mt 12²⁴ 9³⁴) and without the concluding utterance which he, in common with Mark, attaches to the discussion. Now it will have been noticed above that

Luke's presentation of the second form of the reported saying is the more concise, being without the eschatological close (12^{32c}); but it will have been realised also that the original sin against man which lay at the root of the Marcan recension is lost sight of entirely, and only the derivative terms of the climax—Jesus (the Son of man) and the Holy Spirit (God)—remain.

We feel that we must regard it as inconceivable that the explicit contrast which came to dominate the non-Markan form of the tradition is authentic; but we must also remember that although secondary it cannot be late, because of the early dropping of the term Son of man as a synonym for Jesus during His earthly career. We can, however, be grateful that Matthew has afforded us a means of solution by reverently preserving side by side the two formally inconsistent strata of the transmission of reminiscences of such a saying—whether the attachment thereof to so dramatic an episode be historically correct or no—and that he has thereby supplied as well adequate witness to the confusion arising from transplanting a current Aramaic idiom into the Greek tongue, in which it came to have almost immediately a highly specialised Christian connotation.

Our Marcan recension, then, although probably an inexact translation and a reminiscence already expanded, and closing a discussion which indeed breaks the connexion where it is introduced, yet keeps truly the original contrast that was intended by our Lord.

It therefore had nothing to do outwardly at first with Himself as the mysterious Son of man or the glorious Messiah in future divine dignity, but simply applied to Him as He appeared to His foes and friends alike in full humanity: He argues as a man amongst men.

Thus this occurrence of the expression also tells us really nothing as to His inherent consciousness or His convictions regarding future prerogatives and functions. Yet to have left these last three passages uninvestigated might have caused some misunderstanding as to their original non-significance, on the assumption of their authenticity, for the purpose of our special inquiry as to the outlook of Jesus. It must be admitted that it appears almost impossible in the first two of these instances to recover the original language with certainty. As man Jesus declared forgiveness to the palsied, as He did to others who came to Him sick in body and soul; but to the evangelists it was as the Son of man, the Lord from heaven. So too as man our Lord abrogated Sabbath regulations; but to the Christians of the period of Gospel-compilation it was because of His authority as a divine being. That the later view was perfectly correct from the standpoint of the Master's fully developed inner consciousness we need not doubt; but that the inference could be drawn at the time by hearers or onlookers is what is hard to believe, because of the sufficiently attested reserve of Jesus as well as because of the lack of smoothness in the records.

G. THE SON

We have seen in the early sections of this chapter how the Son of man conception looks mainly to the future, and how the name indicates our Lord Himself in the sense that He knows that He will fulfil and more than fulfil that which the mysterious apocalyptic figure so termed had stood for in the speculative hopes of His people. For Him, however, there is the conviction that heavenly majesty must be preceded by an earthly career progressively marked by indifference and rejection, by obloquy, maltreatment and physical suffering before that death which was to be the dark gateway to manifest glory in the coming of and in the Father's Kingdom. That was the secret which had been revealed to Him apparently through the medium of mediation upon the prophetic scriptures and especially those concerning the Servant of Yahweh. That was the secret which He sought to reveal to His incredulous intimates ; although the terminology at His disposal was quite inadequate, and contemporary conceptions were burst like wine-skins dried and worn by the contents from His Son-consciousness which He was impelled to pour into them. This is what leads us to seek for* and to set forth from the synoptic narratives some other traces of that consciousness which are of a yet more intimate and permanent nature.

Twice in His own reported words such appear to emerge: once in the Marcan and once also in the dual

tradition derived from the other main source. The former, but for the difference of the expression, might have been taken in connexion with the passages relative to the coming of the Son of man.

1. In the eschatological discourse, at the close of the "little apocalypse" portion, our Lord is represented by the triple transmission as saying quite definitely, in connexion with the fig-tree's promise of summer, that "this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away" in the catastrophe of the divine visitation coincident with the advent of the Kingdom; "but my words shall not pass away," their fulfilment is assured (Mk 13^{30f.}, Mt 24^{34f.}, Lk 21^{32f.}). Then comes the stumbling-block for all who would seek to underestimate the real humanity of the Lord with its inalienable limitations: "But of that day or that hour (and hour, Mt.) knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, not even the Son, but the Father" (32, Mt 36 probably with syr. sin. omits "not even the Son," and adds "only" at the close).

Luke does not represent this saying at all, but passes at once to the practical exhortation to watchfulness, and that in terms peculiar to himself (21^{34ff.}). Yet he too knows by implication of some such utterance, and can scarcely have omitted it merely because he deemed it derogatory, for he relates as words of the risen Lord in response to the disciples' inquiry as to the time of the "restoring the kingdom to Israel" the saying: "It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the

Father hath appointed by his own authority" (ἐθέτο ἐν, Ac 1⁷). Still, it must be admitted to be somewhat strange that Luke should have passed over this utterance at the close of the teaching derived from Mark about the end, if it was part of the second Gospel as he had it. And undoubtedly there would be a tendency to extend this collocation of sayings on eschatological matters which concludes this chapter. But the preceding verses (13^{30f.}), although apocalyptic in tone and strictly inconsistent with the context, must have been associated very early, for if our texts be reliable all three editors record them with virtual identity. Luke, as we have just shown, has no trace of the saying concerning the Son's knowledge in this context, and only reproduces the gist of it in another manner at the opening of his second volume.

Should the clause "οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός" not be authentic, it is hard to account for it. It would have to be a very primitive insertion recording a surprising fact, which the rapidly developing reverence for the Master soon eliminated; as was possibly the case with the verse in the third Gospel and probably so with the clause in Matthew. But if clause and verse are genuine words of Jesus, He must have referred not to the fact of the imminence of the end which is asserted again and again, but to the ignorance of the heavenly instruments, which is a not unfamiliar mark of their subordinate dignity, and also to that of His own Son-consciousness as to the actual time of its momentary and universal occurrence.

2. There is but one other instance where Jesus is

reported to have designated Himself "the Son." The passage is contained in the remarkable thanksgiving from the lips of Jesus reported in Q, and reproduced by both Matthew and Luke: to it we must now direct our attention. In the first Gospel, after the conflated collection of instructions to "the twelve" (10), we have the episode of John's message and the reflexions upon him and his mission uttered by our Lord (11¹⁻¹⁹), followed by the woes on certain unreceptive cities (20-24); then, in answer to the self-satisfied orthodox and to the indifferent populations who alike rejected His message, He breaks into an outburst of exultant thanksgiving for the revelation to the simple people who have accepted His proclamation of the Kingdom and have clung loyally to Him in earnest self-fitting and in self-denying preparation of others for its coming. In language redolent of Jewish psalm and supplication we are told: "At that season Jesus answered and said, I thankfully confess to thee (ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι), Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide (aor.) these things (the conviction of the nearness of the reign of God and the coincident judgement) from (the) wise and understanding (the superior conservative doctors who but re-echo and develop the dicta of Rabbis of old time) and didst reveal them unto babes (simple provincial folk, almost synonymous with the legally ignorant and therefore despised "people of the land"; cf. 21¹⁶ for a literal application of Ps 8²): yea, Father, (I thankfully confess) that so it was well-pleasing (εὐδοκία ἐγένετο, recalling the words of the voice

at the Baptism) in thy sight. All (the teaching which my proclamation has involved, even though rejected alike by orthodox people and by familiar townsmen, was delivered to me in direct personal inward revelation) by my Father, and none recognised (reading *ἐγώ*, as Justin, etc.) the Father (as author and inspirer of the transforming tidings) save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal (it)," that is, the faithful adherents (^{25ff.}). Then ensues in Matthew the royal invitation: "Come unto me" (^{28ff.}).

Luke records the woes upon the cities (^{10^{12ff.}}) and the outburst of praise from Jesus closely together; but the passages are attached to his second series of instructions, probably taken from Q, which he regards as a charge to "the seventy" (¹⁻¹¹), and he makes the immediate cause of the utterance of the glad thanksgiving for the blessed experience of His Son-consciousness to be the joyful return of those same pioneer preachers and healers—joyful because of the forces of the coming Kingdom of God manifest in and through their victory over spirit-powers of evil.

"In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said," is Luke's characteristic introduction (²¹); and possibly the subsequent words were identical with the original behind our Matthean recension. But the passage was evidently already an exegetical problem in the sub-apostolic age. It will have been noticed that in translating above we have omitted the apparently overburdening clauses which seem to be derived from

the reading of the present tense (*ἰπιγινώσκει* or *γινώσκει*), and then interpret the words not of a special aspect of Son-consciousness, but of an ever-present metaphysical Sonship in the Johannine manner. Thus even our best texts appear to mean: "no one recogniseth the Son (who the Son is, Lk.), save the Father, neither doth any-one recognise the Father (and who the Father is, Lk.), save the Son," etc. (Mt ²⁷, Lk ²²); but the variable position of the former clause in Fathers and MSS. betrays its later origin. The only alternative seems to be to interpret the verse as an analogy from human relationship to illustrate the oneness of the revelation. Luke then proceeds most appropriately, as if continuing smoothly the sayings from his source, with a benediction of the disciples as sharers with Him of that revelation; thus affording a direct and very primitive confirmation of our mode of explaining in paraphrase the difficult utterance. "And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see," etc. (^{23f.}), a beatitude relative to the privilege of living at the time of the in-coming Kingdom which is given a more limited and less appropriate significance by Matthew, as he inserts it in the Marcan story just before the interpretation of the first parable to the disciples (13^{16f.}). The ease of applying this to the members of the Spirit-endowed Church is obvious.

It may be objected that this passage, like those in the last section, has nothing to do with the eschatological

teaching of Jesus; but it is connected therewith, inasmuch as it is from this consciousness of unique and intimate Sonship, which attains its loftiest, most poetic and most ecstatic (Lk 10²¹) expression here, that our Lord's doctrine with regard to the future arises. And in the religious language of His people Sonship afforded the deepest and richest symbol to convey His unique experience. Nor did this consciousness of peculiar filial relationship emerge suddenly. We do not know, however, the inner working of the personality of our dearest friend, and only with trembling reverence can we venture to suggest anything about the development of the convictions of Jesus as man. Yet the scanty evidence even of the Gospel records suggests that He was convinced of a sonship different from that of other men, and that possibly even before the decisive Baptism experience which was according to Mark (1¹⁰) for Himself alone. The childhood story which Luke affords (2^{41ff.}) is neither likely to have been invented under the influence of tales about other religious founders, nor to have arisen without some historical nucleus, it is so thoroughly Jewish. When "the boy Jesus" became "a son of the law," there is every reason to believe that such would be an occasion psychologically fitting for some emergence of that consciousness of vocation which received final confirmation and so fixed definitely His life-work of unflinching filial devotion in the vision at His Baptism. We do not know what was the cumulative effect of learning and meditating on "the sacred writings," of

family piety and of the experience brought by His human calling in the little town upon so sensitive a soul. But we may venture to suppose than an acute observance of men and things and an eager reading of the events of His time in the light of an intimate knowledge of the prophetic writings, together with a sense of special vocation as yet—humanly speaking—inchoate and undefined, impelled Him to participate in the religious fervour stimulated throughout the land by the solitary reforming prophet “on Jordan’s banks, with his startling appeal for repentance before the imminent judgement; and urged Him to accept personally that preparatory act of baptism—external token of repentant character-change—in association with His own people.

And this course of action was probably quite apart from any definite thoughts of sinlessness in His human mind—a problem which had, nevertheless, arisen already and evoked its own line of apologetic before the composition of the first Gospel (Mt 3^{14f.}). After the Baptism, the vision and the voice of His ecstatic experience determined (so to speak) for ever the personal conviction of a divine calling peculiar to Himself, and that consisting essentially in a filial relationship, which passed—with what rapidity or crises of development we are ignorant—through Sonship-consciousness to that of kingly authority, of future Messiahship, and of the fulfilment of functions ascribed to the apocalyptic Son of man.

But we do not possess sufficient data either to separate

these stages or to trace out their conscious emergence. Only we feel that the oldest strata of the Gospel-tradition cannot be wrong in testifying to this authoritative inward sense of divine Sonship being primary during our Lord's ministerial activity, and the special aspect of it, Messiahship, with the consequent transmuting of current conceptions thereof, secondary.

It is a well-known psychological generalisation that the nature of a vision is intimately related to strongly impressed mental pictures; so here: "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (Mk 1¹¹), together with the dove-like descending form, suggest very readily as possible a previous close meditation on the Servant of Yahweh sections, beginning: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my spirit upon him" (Is 42¹; cf. the Enochic title, the Elect (40⁵ etc.), and the voice (Lk 9³⁵) at the Transfiguration). In this connexion we must not overlook the fact that there is some tendency to regard the "Western" reading transmitted in Lk 3²² as possibly original: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Ps 2⁷); inasmuch as Christendom for some centuries regarded the Baptism as in a sense the birth-day of the Christ, His true "epiphany." But if this were the authentic tradition, giving the very words which Jesus alone could have told when He divulged His inner experience, it would in no wise preclude even then a growing preparatory consciousness of a peculiar relationship to God, the conviction of a special

mission, and that fostered by scriptural meditation. Still it remains true that the sense of Sonship was anterior to and wider in conception than that of Messiahship in the human mental experience of Jesus.

Further, the record of the Temptation, which succeeds immediately in all the Synoptists, supplies corroborative evidence that the struggle in thought was concerned with various aspects and possibilities arising out of this newly realised consciousness of Sonship, before any clear scheme of God's will for His Messianic vocation had become formulated (so to speak) in His mind. For we can hardly doubt that the main features in the description of that solitary conflict of soul come from words of Jesus Himself to the disciples, and are not an apologetic invention, although the traditional setting may be later. The test in each case turned on the use of yet latent powers associated with the conviction of unique Sonship—"If thou art the Son of God"; and the rejection of each conceivable use thereof depended as far as its verbal expression was concerned on that very judicious balancing of different well-remembered scriptures which became so notable a feature in His public argumentation.

We have exhibited and discussed these Sonship passages at the close of the varied Son of man references, because we are convinced that the Son of man cycle of ideas, apocalyptic and eschatological though they were, and insufficient in expression, but ready to His hand from the current speculation of His people, came to be intimately associated with that mysterious

and to us unfathomable consciousness of divine Sonship which is the dominant note characteristic of the earthly life of Jesus on the inward side: a consciousness whose beginnings we can but dimly indicate, and whose growth and potency we can but attempt reverently to estimate. And this we are only able to do from its manifestation directly or indirectly in words and deeds which have been recorded, but which form quite an infinitesimal portion of that career which made an impression of such a nature on those who knew Him that no categories less than divine, less than the very highest that they knew, were found to be adequate to be applied to so commanding a personality.

Son of man appears to have been the title already current—whatever its ultimate mythological connexion and its national apocalyptic limitations may have been—which Jesus utilised as the best expression available in the language of His contemporaries for His Son-relationship projected into the future: just as He made use of the conception of the Messiah, inadequate and insufficiently ethical as it was in the manner in which for the most part the Jews of the time cherished it, to indicate His own future position in the coming Kingdom which He heralded and whose latent potencies were already patent in His deeds of mercy, and which filled alike the vista of His thought and constituted throughout the burden of His proclamation. All the special and new ethical features which characterise our Lord's teaching in and by means of eschatological conceptions

already familiar to His hearers arise in a word out of that unassailable conviction of divine Sonship which we can indicate, but can by no means explain. Herein was the divinity of His humanity: herein lay the revelation of Deity.

NOTE

ON THE NON-USE OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF MARK 13 AND PARALLELS

It will probably have been remarked that we have not utilised in the foregoing as part of the material for reconstructing our Lord's view of the future those sections which have come to be regarded as forming the "little apocalypse," whatever be their origin.

Now it may be said that although it cannot be certainly demonstrated that Mk 13^{7f.} 14^{ff.} 24^{ff.} are unauthentic, albeit appearing as if utterances of Jesus, yet no connected and composite discourse similar to that in which these verses are embedded is found elsewhere in Mark, and it must have been virtually of a piece before incorporation; and further, the crude popular anticipations detailed in the specified portions have no parallel in the reports of our Lord's words. But these verses are in close relationship with the esoteric prognostications and speculations of Jewish apocalyptic literature, which used inherited material of great antiquity, the tone and details of which fluctuated according to the circumstances in which any particular "revelation" was composed. We have here with a Christian colouring the traditional horrors of the Messianic "woes,"

the earthly "tribulation," and the celestial disorder connected with the divine "coming"; but no political anticipation is incorporated, and the locality of publication seems to lie westward of Jerusalem ⁽¹⁴⁾.

On the other hand, 13^{9ff.} 15f. 21f. in the same composite production exhibit parallels with authentic words of the Lord reported in other connexions and positions in the synoptic narratives. For example: 13^{9ff.} is found in the missionary instruction Mt 10^{17ff.}, cf. Lk 12^{11f.}; but ¹⁰ breaks the connexion. Moreover, ^{15f.} reappears in Luke's eschatological section, 17³¹; probably the more original position. Again, ^{21f.}, taking up the idea of ⁶, recalls the similar utterance, Lk 17²³.

The ensuing verses (^{23ff.}), however, are for the most part quite in our Lord's manner, and exhibit an eschatology relatively undefined like that of Q.

Now we notice that the reply of Jesus to Peter (and others) opens with a warning, the purport of which is otherwise established as authentic, against false christs (^{5f.}), and in this way—if we may draw an inference from the Ethiopic version of which an account is given by Dr. Rendel Harris in *J.T.S.* XII, No. 45 (Oct. 1910), etc.—the Apocalypse of Peter seems to have begun. The absence in this connexion of allusion to or building up of doctrine on the three eschatological phases contained in the matter suspected as not emanating from Jesus (^{7f.} 14ff. 24ff.) cannot fail to be emphasised as at least tending to justify the belief that they consist of incorporated material, even if we do not go so far as to say that the author of that second century "revelation" did not know them.

After a detailed tabulation of the synoptic reports and an examination of similar material in the apocalyptic literature, the present writer came to the tentative

conclusion that the portions most probably authentic are the drawing of the Master's attention to the Temple buildings ⁽¹⁾ and His prediction of their destruction ⁽²⁾, involving by implication the fall of the city. Some inquiry would naturally follow ^(3f.), but it had originally no immediate relation to "the end of the age" (Mt.) or of the world as was later supposed, and referred only to the local and special event mentioned.

Jesus does not give a direct answer, but the warning ⁽⁶⁾, which is virtually identical with ^{21f.}, and possibly was once immediately connected and continuous) which recurs in similar terms in Luke's eschatological section (17²³) may be original, because it is not typical of the admonitions of the apocalypses.

Then we assume that Jesus, according to His wont, refused any explicit answer of the nature of a sign, but pointed the solemn warning to watch for the imminent catastrophe symbolised in the Temple's destruction by means of the fig-tree parable ^(28f.), and this exhortation has probably undergone expansion by the subsequent attachment of other similar teaching on watchfulness ^(33ff.).

The apostolic question thus served as a convenient starting-point for esoteric teaching, which came to be developed as years went on into the pseudo-Petrine apocalypse and literature of that type; so that the mysterious and private instruction was referred in turn to the fall of Jerusalem, then to the end of the world, and the way was opened to include descriptions of the final Judgement, of Gehenna and of the abode of the blessed. In other words, here was to be found the very natural *point d'appui* for early eschatological speculation; and such, Jewish yet Christian, appears to have been already introduced in the Mark which the other

Synoptists knew, and the latter in their turn added and interpreted. In these phenomena we perceive the beginning of the process of the attachment of associated but strictly inconsistent apocalyptic material. Nor can we be surprised that the south-Palestinian Church with tragedy impending near by failed to preserve the reticence which our Lord had manifested in this respect.

CHAPTER V

RESURRECTION AND LIFE

A. TEACHING ABOUT RESURRECTION

(i) *The Subject in General*

IN order to estimate the teaching of Jesus concerning Resurrection, it would appear best to endeavour to grasp first of all His general attitude to the subject. The data to be found in the records are very scanty: a fact which raises the presumption that our Lord's utterances did not in this matter express views differing in any remarkable degree from the popularly-accepted doctrine of the time as to the event itself. But that the point was raised once at any rate in an acute and critical form at the close of the ministry all the synoptic narratives agree. And as we might expect, the Marcan and Matthean records are in close harmony in relating an episode from this late period, while Luke exhibits divergences of detail both in idea and stylistic expression, quite accountable for by oral information and his Greek training: for there seems to be nothing to lead us to believe that Q contained this discussion.

The Sadducees, who promulgated the opinion that

there is no Resurrection, bring forward a test case—either purely hypothetical or actual, as Matthew implies—of a woman who had had seven men consecutively as husband, in order to learn whose wife she would be, according to the opinion of Jesus, “in the resurrection”; assuming, that is, the materialistic view of a continued physical relationship. Our Lord’s answer to this crude mode of stating their case affords us the chief connected argument on the subject that we have from His lips (Mk 12^{25ff.}, Mt 22^{30ff.}, Lk 20^{34ff.}). It lifts the whole matter at once to the spiritual plane, above all association with normal earthly conditions, as well as corrects a wholly inadequate conception of the nature and power of God.

Here is the Marcan form. “When they shall rise from the dead (For in the resurrection, Mt.), they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven. But as touching the dead, that they are raised (the resurrection of the dead, Mt.); have ye not read in (the place concerning) the Bush, how God spake unto him (that which was spoken unto you by God—*i.e.* it is valid for you Sadducean objectors now, Mt.), saying, I (am) the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. He is not the God of the dead, but of the living (God is not (the God) of, etc., Mt.): ye do greatly err.” In Matthew, however, the charge of ignorance precedes the explanatory teaching: “Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures”—although on the claim of such knowledge their ultra-conservatism was based—

“nor the power of God” to make possible conditions of existence which transcend present human experience.

At the close he emphasises the astonishment of the multitudes.

Now such a spiritualised conception was not entirely new or unknown (cf. below), but a reasoned basis is afforded from the sacred writings whose authority the Lord’s opponents acknowledge as ultimate, and a clear and weighty pronouncement is made to support the fact—known not indeed experimentally but through the intuition of divine Sonship—that in the risen life earthly conditions of sex-relationship no more obtain.

By utilising it for the sake of comparison Jesus evidently accepts herein the more spiritual view of angelic existence which had emerged in some portions of the apocalyptic literature; *e.g.* “Therefore have I created no women for you (angels), for the spirits of heaven have in heaven their dwelling” (En 15⁷).

Moreover, to take the very scriptures on which the Sadducees grounded their denial of a resurrection, the sacred story represents Yahweh as addressing Moses definitely as the patriarchal deity. Such he would not be if the persons named were annihilated or continuing in an unconscious existence. Our Lord then takes life beyond death for granted as a fundamental belief, although it was but of recent and popular development, and held with growing tenacity since the violent ends of the Maccabean heroes (2 Mac 7¹⁴ 12⁴⁸). But such life, beyond the reach of physical disease and death, needs

no marriage bond for the perpetuation of the race, as others among the Jews before and after perceived: *e.g.* "ye will have great joy as the angels of heaven . . . ye will become companions of the heavenly hosts," En 104⁴ 6 (cf. 62⁸. 13^{ff.}; Test. Abraham 13, etc.).

Thus the risen life came to be compared later with the supposed super-physical existence of the star-spirits: "for in the heights of that world will they dwell, and be like the angels, and comparable to the stars," Ap Bar 51¹⁰ (cf. Asc Moses 10⁹, Jub 19²⁵).

Now there is a considerable difference in the way in which Luke reports this pronouncement, alike in more definite limitation and development. "The children of this world marry, etc., but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that age, and the resurrection from the dead neither marry (neither bear, nor beget, syr. sin.), etc., for neither can they (marry or, syr. sin.) die any more: for they are equal unto the angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (20^{34ff.}).

Again, he represents Moses as calling the Lord "the God of Abraham," etc.; and to the words which declare that the God of the patriarchs is a God of living persons he adds the universalistic touch: "for all live unto him" (38), which recalls the living unto God of the Maccabean martyrs (4 Mac 7¹⁹ 16²⁵). In the Lucan record also the limitation of resurrection to the righteous, those accounted worthy—in language of Pauline colouring, *καταξιωθέντες*—to attain it, is much more clearly expressed.

Now over and above the general acceptance in our Lord's day of the doctrine of a resurrection either before or after the Messianic kingdom, the limitation of that resurrection to the righteous (primarily Jews) is by no means confined to the third evangelist in the synoptic records.

But we are led here to the subsidiary consideration of another utterance in the same Gospel, because Luke brings out the point in his peculiar material. When at a meal on one occasion Jesus bade His host to invite the poor, etc., He is reported to have added a stimulus to that unwonted habit by means of the words: "thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just" (Lk¹⁴); an expression which is evidently intended here to have a larger range than that of signifying the punctilious observers of legal righteousness: indeed, we seem to be on the way to the test of loving ministry as exhibited in the Judgement picture (Mt 25).

References like these, if they do not compel us to assume a resurrection of the righteous exclusively, would appear otherwise to imply a special and probably preliminary resurrection of those who are regarded as worthy, just, or righteous enough to share in the Messianic kingdom.

When, however, we inquire as to the current teaching of the age on this question—as far as we are able to trace it, we are hindered by the fact that it is by no means self-consistent. That the righteous alone participate in the resurrection seems to be the doctrine of

a portion of Enoch: "and the righteous (one) will arise from sleep and wisdom will arise and be given to them" (91¹⁰); "your spirits of you who died in righteousness shall live and rejoice and be glad, and their spirits will not perish" (103^{3f.}; cf. 92³ 100⁵; Slav En 65⁸ 66⁷). In the Similitudes, on the other hand, all (the Israelites) seem to rise from the under-world, and the righteous and holy are separated for redemption (En 51^{1f.}); and this finds support in the teaching that the number of those accounted worthy—"the number of righteousness"—must be complete (for resurrection) before the judgement which is to avenge them (47⁴; cf. 61⁵ 62⁸). Yet that resurrection is the exclusive boon of the just in Israel appears to be taught also in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs; *e.g.* it is those who are (legally) blameless (Sim 6⁷), the patriarchs of old first of all (Jud 25^{1.4}), and the keepers of the law (Zeb 10^{2f.}). Still, on the other side the relative universalism of Dn 12 and En 1-36 is extended in Benj 10^{6ff.} by including the heathen in the resurrection for judgement: perhaps Christian influence has affected this. Again, in the Psalms of Solomon it is the fulfillers of the Pharisaic ideal of righteousness, "they that fear the Lord," who "shall rise unto eternal life" (3¹²; cf. 13¹¹ 14⁸). In a similar way Apoc Baruch, after the fall of the city, teaches that it is the legally and religiously righteous who also cherish the Messianic hope that partake in the resurrection (30¹ 42⁷ 49).

There is traceable too in the Apocalypse of Ezra,

although the context (4^{32ff.}) seems universalistic, the same limitation to the righteous whose number is known to God alone (³⁶), and who are kept in their treasure-chambers till the Judgement (³⁵ etc.). With this widely evidenced restriction the Didache definitely agrees, when it makes it clear that the resurrection is "not of all, but as is said (quoting Zech 14⁵), the Lord shall come and all the saints with him" (16⁷). It is a noteworthy support to this varied testimony that such teaching survived amidst the more universalistic literature of later Judaism (*e.g.* bab Ber 58^b, bab Rosh ha Sh 16^b).

We may well remark here that sufficient weight is not generally allowed to the fact that the underlying assumption of St. Paul's language in his letters is that those who partake in the resurrection and share the eternal life are the righteous, *i.e.* primarily the faithful Christians; cf. 1 Th 4^{16f.}, 2 Th 1⁵, Ro 2⁷. It is hardly likely that in this teaching St. Paul would stand alone: there is no sense of strangeness exhibited in its setting forth. We shall find that the doctrine of Jesus concerning Life, as well as that which has been reviewed already relative to the Kingdom of God, leads in the main to the same conclusion that the only resurrection worthy of the name is that of the just.

Now we must return to the special characteristics in the Lucan report of the argument against the Sadducees. The peculiar turns of phrase, "that age" (20³⁵), "equal unto the angels," "sons of God . . . sons of the resurrec-

tion" (³⁶), seem to be explanatory expressions current with the Palestinian informants of the author, rather than his own revising of the Marcan form. "That age" contrasts with "this age" of the previous verse. "Sons of God" (cf. Job 38⁷, En 69^{4f.} etc.=angels) recalls "sons of the Highest" (³⁵), while "sons of the resurrection" follows the familiar Hebrew formation (*e.g.* "son of death," signifying worthy of death); cf. "sons of the light," of those fit for the life one of whose characteristics is light, *i.e.* the pious, the righteous in the age to come (16⁸; cf. En 108¹¹ 61⁸).

It appears to be evident that only the righteous dead are contemplated in this the most definite utterance on the subject reported from our Lord; but it must be remembered that the circumstances did not demand that stress should be laid on this fact, but rather on the nature of the life of such as should be raised. It is any solely material earthly existence, like that of cases recovered by our Lord's healing power in the course of His ministry, that is entirely excluded.

Thus the popular view of sensuous physical pleasures and prosperity so widely exhibited in apocalyptic writings both Jewish and Christian, and taken over into the teaching of Islam, was just as definitely contradicted and thereby discountenanced by Jesus in this elevating and spiritualising of the conception of the risen life as in the loftiest teaching of the Rabbis at a later time; *e.g.* "In the age to come there is neither eating nor drinking, nor marrying nor envy nor hatred, but the pious repose

with crowns on their heads, and are satisfied with the glory of God" (bab Ber 17^a). It should be noted that no personal claim to be the agent of the Resurrection (as was Saoshyant in later Persian doctrine) is traceable in the synoptic records (contrast Jn 11²⁵ 5²¹ etc.), but sometimes in Rabbinic writings the delegation to Messiah of authority to quicken the dead is named (*e.g.* bab Sanh 113^a), just as also the raising of men was expected in his "days" (88^b).

(ii) *The Resurrection of Jesus*

Before passing on to the inferences which may be drawn from passages referring to the life of the righteous after the act of resurrection, we must revert to the allusions made by the Son of man to His own rising or being raised. In the Gospels the expressions appear to be really synonymous; but the passive form brings out the divine side of the action, as frequently in Acts (2²⁴. 32^f. 3¹³ etc.).

Jesus is first recorded to have made reference to His being raised, in that gradual revelation of suffering which followed the confession by St. Peter (Mt 16²¹, Lk 9²²), and also in the less probably authentic allusion to His preceding the disciples to Galilee (Mk 14²⁸, Mt 26³²). Matthew again uses the passive expression in relating the disciples' dispute as to the meaning of the injunctions to silence after the Transfiguration (17⁹), and in reporting another indefinitely located prediction of suffering and subsequent glory (23).

None of these further instances seem to be known to

Luke, and they are combined with various forms of apology for the obtuseness or misunderstanding of the apostles, who are represented as having heard and failed to appreciate such definite pronouncements, or else as sorrowing instead of rejoicing. Manifestly the least that we are compelled to infer is that the resurrection aspect of these predictions only took the precise and definite form in which they are transmitted after the appearances of the risen Lord (cf. Jn 12¹⁶, of the entry into Jerusalem).

In the Marcan tradition of the first two predictions of the Passion the active term is utilised (8³¹ 9⁹). We find it also in the post-resurrection narrative peculiar to Luke, in which the risen Jesus is represented as elucidating the meaning of the scriptures to the eleven: "that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day" (24⁴⁶). This is merged in the subsequent verses into the universal charge, the programme which is repeated and filled out in detail at the opening of his second volume (Ac 1⁸). Although this episode does not strictly come under the utterances of Jesus in His earthly life, yet it may be based on some reminiscence therefrom, and at any rate it reflects the consciousness of the disciples as they pondered over the Passion and Death of their Master now evidently set forth to them as glorified, and as they found in these events an adequate fulfilment of the experiences recorded in the passages concerning the Servant of Yahweh in the book of Isaiah. But could this illumination of a

portion of the sacred writings, as yet so far as we know unapplied to the Messiah, and this revelation of a universal mission in His name, proceed ultimately from any other source than Jesus Himself? Were they not then perfectly justified in recording their own new-founded conviction as if it were expressed in the Lord's own words? Moreover, upon this personal message of the risen Jesus Luke has stamped the impress of his own style.

We may indeed feel somewhat disappointed at the scantiness of the material afforded by the synoptic writers in regard of the idea of resurrection, whether viewed with relation to men in general or the Son of man in particular; but we are perhaps led thereby to recollect that the act of being raised or rising from the dead only marks symbolically—though it was doubtless conceived literally and realistically—the transition, the change, so to speak, from mundane to heavenly conditions, from the physical to the spiritual as then understood. What we are really desirous to learn from the teaching of the Lord is rather—What revelation does He give us as regards the state to which the righteous rise?

In other words, it is that which is beyond the act or experience of resurrection which interested the majority of the Jews in that age of transition, and exercises a fascination over the religiously minded modern man as well. From the standpoint of the individual, this state is expressed by the term *Life*, and cognate words and phrases. However it is viewed, and under whatever imagery it may be represented, and whatever attributes

may be predicted of it, it is Life—life in the fullest sense, alone worthy of the name. The utterances which have been preserved, or which have been ascribed to Jesus regarding Life, must therefore be brought now under review. It will be found to be the richest single term, but still unfathomed and indeed unfathomable under earthly limitations, for the condition of each pious individual beyond the Resurrection, a foretaste of which constitutes a blessedness possible to be obtained even here and now.

For a classification of the varied Jewish teaching about the subjects of the Resurrection, etc., cf. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, 237 ff.

B. THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING LIFE

1. Each of the synoptic evangelists incorporates in the same place in the tradition (after the blessing of the little children) the episode of the questioner—who is undefined, save in Luke, where he is called a “ruler”—who asks what he should do to inherit eternal life (Mk 10¹⁷, Mt 19^{16f.}, Lk 18¹⁸). Doubtless we may take the Marcan form of this story to be the most approximate to the original.

Here the verses which are material for our purpose may be quoted.

The object in view, inheritance of eternal life, is identical in all the reports. The questioner as the sequel indicates is wealthy, and our Lord intimates to him, self-satisfied as he is with his own fulfilment of the commandments, that if he indeed desires to “do” some-

thing by way of manifesting his fitness for that "eternal life" which is his aim, a great act of self-sacrifice is needed—"Go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven" (21). Matthew prefaces this behest by adding: "if thou wilt be perfect" (21), just as he previously made Jesus introduce His teaching as to the primary duty of knowing and observing the commandments with the words: "but if thou wouldst enter into life, keep," etc. (17). Luke for his part omits "Go," and emphasises the sacrifice of wealth, "all that thou hast" (22), which must precede in this case the life of discipleship.

Clearly, therefore, in this conversation "treasure in heaven" is synonymous with "eternal life" in so far as it is an appropriate image, a qualitative estimate, thereof; and to Matthew at least "life" and the state of perfection are interchangeable.

But in each Gospel a discussion upon the subject of entering the Kingdom of God—life, that is, from the point of sight of the society of the elect, the aggregate of accepted or saved individuals—ensues between Jesus and His disciples, after the questioner, saddened, but unwilling to make the great renunciation, has departed. Here the essential feature in the argument is the difficulty of entry for such as contemporary opinion deemed especially blessed by reason of their prosperity in this life. As Mark has it: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God. . . . It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for

a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (23. 25). With this homely and probably familiar proverb our Lord fixes the lesson of the scene just enacted, and we can be little surprised that He awakens the astonishment of His hearers thereby: "who then can be saved?" (26). We omit of necessity the intervening verse (24); for, besides preserving a form of answer that is textually unreliable, the amazement of the disciples is duplicated, and further, neither Matthew nor Luke seem to have any knowledge of the twofold answer and astonishment; yet all agree in the startled query, Who, if not the rich, can find favour with God and obtain salvation? The evangelists are at one also in placing immediately after this the very human inquiry of Peter as to what the disciples who had renounced all and followed Jesus—both of which the recent questioner had failed to do—should have. The exact form of our Lord's answer does not concern us here, but the solemn close was evidently remembered, and it recalls the opening question of the episode. The boon outweighing all the struggle and suffering is this: "in the age to come eternal life" (30). This is "received," according to Luke (30) as well as Mark, and "inherited" in Matthew's account (29), which may purposely reproduce the inquirer's words, or be indeed the current Jewish phrase actually used by Jesus.

It is to be noted, then, that to the transmitters of this narrative at least, "kingdom of God," salvation and "eternal life" were synonymous, and but expressed the

same state—that of the righteous in the future—from different points of sight (cf. p. 335). We must see now if there are other passages in common or single transmission which bear out this statement.

2. In the first and second Gospels there is appended to the Lord's teaching about making others to stumble utterances dealing with causing the self to stumble, expressed in highly figurative language in terms of the limbs or the senses. The present form of Mark exhibits a group of such sayings, after the warning against hindering "the little ones" who are believers, which was attached presumably from association because of the common thought of stumbling.

Better were it to destroy the power or capacity for sin in oneself, be it hand or foot, because "it is good for thee to enter into life maimed" (Mk 9⁴³) or "halt" (⁴⁵) rather than suffer the extreme divine penalty; so also "it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye" (⁴⁷) rather than endure the same physically complete.

It would be mistaken, of course, to press this startling imagery, especially as it indirectly demonstrates the inadequacy of the realistic conception popularly held by the Jews—and also by the Muslims later—that the resurrection body would be exactly as it had been in this life, whether complete or in any way mutilated. Such a view is refuted by our Lord's own statement (Mk 12²⁵ ||).

We find that Matthew has a similar passage, only

compressed by the fusing of the illustrations from hand and foot, and it is placed after his small collection of utterances suggested by "a little child . . . in the midst," and he uses the same expression: "it is good for thee to enter into life" (18^{8f.}). But apart from the grouping of which the first evangelist is fond, exhibiting and extending the normal association in oral transmission, we have a couple of verses incorporated in the Sermon material (5^{29f.}); the danger of self-seduction by means of the eye coming first, suggested apparently by the "looking on a woman" in the previous verse. The verses admittedly mar the connexion here, as the adultery question leads on easily to that of divorce (31^{f.}); but their importance for our immediate purpose lies in this: that the sayings here about self-offence are in a doublet form, which, though negative rather than positive, may in itself be more original. Nothing is said of entering into life, absolutely, in the Marcan manner; but the profitableness of the symbolic self-mutilation consists in the negative good, "and not thy whole (*i.e.* complete) body be cast" (29) or "go" (30) into Gehenna, which is pictured as the result obviated by one member "perishing." It appears evident that some sayings regarding a man's causing himself to stumble by reason of the abuse of some capacity or member were current in more than one traditional recension, thus being found in Mark as well as in Q, and, if that be correct, omitted by Luke as too Jewish in colouring for his Gentile readers; or else they are to be accounted for by having

been incorporated from a tradition still unfixed in words or position both in Mark and Matthew (5), in each case the attachment being attributable to a single connecting word or idea.

3. Again, in the figure of the gate or door, reported by both Matthew (7^{13f.}) and Luke (13²⁴) in different positions in the story, and going back to one original source—probably in this case also Q—behind its slightly differentiated forms, we have “life” used in a similar absolute manner in Matthew, although something of the kind is implied but not expressed in Luke. Matthew has: “Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life” (7¹⁴); while Luke, in response to the moot question as to the fewness of the saved, gives our Lord’s reply—unsatisfactory indeed to the curiosity of the inquirer—in the form of a general behest: “Strive (ἀγωνίζεσθε) to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able.”

This entering in is clearly that of those who are fitted therefor into a continuous experience which might be expressed in terms of life, or joy, or the Kingdom; as we learn from the figure of the closed door which we have in various similitudes and parables to which reference will have to be made later in dealing with the subject of Judgement (p. 289 ff.).

4. Another allusion to “inheriting” eternal life occurs in the material peculiar to Luke, the so-called great interpolation, but in connexion with an episode

comparable with that of the scribe's inquiry on the day of questions (Mk 12^{28ff.} ||). The words are not from Jesus, but are recorded as those of the lawyer's test question: "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" (10²⁵), the underlying fallacy being the same as that in the case of a previous inquirer (Mk 10^{17ff.} ||; for the phrase, cf. En 40⁹ 37⁴, Aboth 1⁵ 5¹⁹, bab Ber 61^b). In the Lucan story, having agreed as to the basis of daily conduct, our Lord is represented as closing the discussion with the words: "this do, and thou shalt live"—now and hereafter, in a sense worthy of the absolute use of the term (10²⁸). The subsequent query in self-justification as to his "neighbour" elicits the parable of the Good Samaritan.

In this instance, if accurately reported, our Lord's use of the word "live" would be suggested by the form of the opening question.

5. Finally, at the close of the picture of judgement upon the basis of ministering love practised or omitted, we find the verdict summed up in the words: "these shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life" (Mt 25⁴⁶; cf. the patriarchs rise on the right hand with joy, Test Benj 10⁶). This solemn but awful close to the final group of parables in the first Gospel may not, indeed, come as a single continuous utterance from Jesus, for it concludes editorially what appears to be complex material; but it does reinforce the inference already drawn that "eternal life" is only associated with the righteous, whether by Jesus Himself

or by the evangelists. It is worthy of note in this connexion, as will appear elsewhere (p. 316), that the term "eternal" is nowhere predicated of the existence or of the suffering of the wicked even in Matthew, with his cruder apocalyptic tendencies.

There is every reason to believe that our Lord would utilise expressions which were current coin; and "eternal life" seems to have been a phrase in common use at least since early in the second century B.C.; *e.g.* the verse in Daniel, epoch-making as regards the doctrine of the resurrection: "some shall awake to everlasting life" (12²); the hope of the Maccabean martyrs: "the King of the world shall raise up us, who have died for his laws, unto an eternal renewal of life" (2 Mac 7⁹, cf. 36, "short pain of everflowing life"); and in the so-called Psalms of Solomon: "they that fear the Lord shall rise again into eternal life" (31⁶; cf. "the life of the righteous is for ever," 13⁹).

Eternal life for the just is familiar also in the Enochic literature. In the Similitudes the patriarch receives from God "the lot of eternal life" (37⁴), while "the righteous shall be in the light of the sun and the elect in the light of eternal life" (58³) and "the Lord of spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of man they will eat, lie down and rise up to all eternity" (62¹⁴). Further, as illustrating the very phrase of the questioners in the Gospel story, we have the angel (Phanuel) spoken of as the one "who is set over the repentance and hope of those who inherit eternal life" (40⁹). Such inheriting

or taking in possession eternal life is found in Slav Enoch; "inherit the endless which is to come" (50²). "Eternal life" passed over into the Targums as well as the more common phrase "the life of the age to come"; but in later Judaism that which is "inherited" is limited to the Holy Land of their forefathers, or the Holy City (cf. *Pes rab* I, *Sanh* 111¹, *bab Keth* 111^b). In general it is thus conceived of throughout as earthly life glorified, but unbroken any more by death.

If we can regard the Lucan addition noted above (p. 212), "for all live unto him," *i.e.* God, as authentic, we may recall, in addition to 2 Mac. before quoted, the similar statements of *Pss Sol.*, that those "who fear the Lord . . . will live in the mercy of their God (15¹⁵), and of the Book of Jubilees, that the blessed "shall live" unharassed by any ill "and all their days will be days of blessing and salvation" (23²⁹); in this case, of course, it is the earth-life which is in question. But "live" is used in the eschatological sense in apocalyptic writings, *e.g.* *Ap Ezra* (7¹³⁷ 8⁶ 14²²), and *Ap Baruch* (76⁵).

On the other hand, if the phrase be due to Luke's universalism, it is an extension which has no relation whatever to the original question at issue with the Sadducees.

"Life," absolutely, with a future connotation, is naturally not met with in the Old Testament, but we find in 2 Mac "resurrection unto life" (abs. 7¹⁴); and in *Pss Sol.* the saints "will inherit life" (14⁶), and "he that

doeth righteousness will treasure for himself life from the Lord" (9⁹); while it is the boon of the blessed in the age to come in Ap Ezra (7¹²⁹) and Ap Baruch (19¹).

"Entering into life," as if it were through a gate or door, does not appear to have been a common expression, although we have the pathway leading to Gehenna spoken of (Ap Bar 85¹³); but Life personified was contrasted with Destruction, each bringing forth its own at the resurrection (42⁷), as the way of light was differentiated from that of darkness (Slav En 30¹⁵). In these metaphors of Jesus we may rightly discern some connexion with the doctrine of "the two ways," which played so large a part in both Jewish and Jewish-Christian (Didache) ethics. There appears to be no occasion to read into our Lord's teaching about Life any of the ideas connected with the religion of the Mysteries, the influence of which was only felt in the formulation of sacramental doctrine at a much later period (John, Odes of Solomon).

C. INDIRECT TEACHING

(i) *The Future of the Blessed in Figures*

The scantiness of material with which to satisfy a natural human curiosity as regards the bliss of pious souls beyond death and resurrection is due, it may be, in part to the silence of the reporters and transmitters of the tradition; because the buoyant hope of the first age required no documentary support when Christians

with their simple and limited cosmology looked eagerly heavenward for their "redemption," for the glorious coming of their Lord, who was absent indeed to mortal sight, yet ever-present spiritually in the communities of His own.

Partly, perhaps, the small amount of relevant matter is due to the habit of Jesus in rebuking, openly by word and silently as we may infer by the example of His reticence, the speculative apocalyptic descriptions and calculations of His own people concerning the crisis of their national deliverance and the ensuing bliss or woe, although these indeed reflected an ethical sense of present inequalities, their indomitable longing and their undying hope.

Whether the instruction were public or private, it is evident that our Lord busied Himself with principles and not with details; and these principles applied to the life of every day rendered the minute and earnest discussion of the happiness of the just or the doom of the wicked unnecessary and vain; because the centre of interest and activity was shifted to the present, to the ceaseless striving of self-fitting, so that what lay in the unveiled future needed no speculation, but was left in confident trust to divine justice and the Father's love. But the teaching of Jesus was no philosophy, nor was it a system of ethics conceived in an atmosphere apart from the conditions of the daily struggles and woes and sufferings of the lower levels of a provincial population itself despised and misunderstood by the world-rulers

of the time. Rather was it that our Lord made His transforming ethics permeate the contemporary eschatological conceptions and imagery which He utilised. Let us turn to the metaphors which we find on His lips relative to the blissful life of the righteous.

(a) *Reward*.—Foremost in the indirect references of our Lord to the existence of the blessed in the coming age we are not surprised to find the heartening and encouraging metaphorical conceptions of reward and recompense ; transfigured indeed by spiritualisation, no more sensuous, no more crudely materialistic, but nevertheless clearly present in the teaching.

For the ideal world where virtue is its own reward, the fancy of the philosopher and the solace of the mystic soul, was far out of the range of "the common people" who formed the normal auditory of Jesus.

Where legal observance dominated religion, reward must necessarily have loomed large for the pious fulfillers of ceremonial duties which were assumed to be well-pleasing to God.

1. We possess a precious fragment in a negative form in the saying about "a cup of water," but the exact wording is doubtful, and in the Marcan order the succeeding utterances on offences make a striking contrast. Although it appears in our text both of Matthew and Mark, yet it does not fit the context exactly in either case, but is possibly one of those haunting memories which passed from disciple to disciple, apart from Q or any continuous record of our Lord's utterances.

In Mark it has become attached to the story of the apostle John's eager jealousy in desiring to forbid one who was exorcising in the name of Jesus. And the Master taught how a co-worker could not be against them. "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink, because (lit. in name that) ye are Christ's, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward" (9⁴¹); as if this were an encouragement to unofficial assistance in their work. In Matthew, however, the saying has come in as a gloss in the conflated charge to the disciples (10⁴²), which seems to have become a sort of instruction concerning the reception of missionaries: "whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones (*i.e.* disciples, mentioned by Mk. in his subsequent verse, 9⁴²) a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple (because that is the capacity in which he comes), verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." The Kingdom is the end alike for the messengers and for the recipients of the message. Here the words are associated with the preceding descending series, reception of Jesus, of a prophet, of a righteous man (^{40f.}); with which we may contrast from the Testaments the failure to perceive a patriarch and a righteous man (Dan 2). Obviously "Christ's" as a proper name cannot be original, even supposing it to be genuine in Mark; yet either the "my name" of some MSS. or the Matthean form, signifying "because you are my disciple," might be so. But the point for our present purpose is in the negative stress

laid on the reward, presumably with and from God (cf. Ap Ez 8³³ 13⁵⁶, Gr Ap Bar 15), in the coming age.

In a similar manner the fitting reward is promised immediately before in Matthew to the welcomer of prophet or just man as such (⁴¹).

Only be it noted the "reward" is but an extra, as it were, an encouragement for those striving to reach the Christian ideal of love: Jesus, the prophet, the righteous, are welcomed for themselves alone.

2. But we are not destitute of positive teaching on the subject of reward in heaven or from God. The beatitude of the persecuted in some form may well be attributed to Jesus, especially if we are prepared to admit that material quoted in the Sermon utterances was not necessarily spoken early in the ministry in Galilee. But that the experience is thrown into the past ("have been persecuted," Mt 5¹⁰) certainly seems to reflect the sufferings of the infant community. The verse dealing with reward (¹²), however, looks forward to the attitude of the disciples under persecution which is sure to come, and the saying (^{11f.}) probably belongs to Q, for the terms are preserved in Luke also: "Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for, behold, your reward is great in heaven; for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets" (6²³). This "their" would either reflect the attitude of the Gentile-Christian towards the persecuting Jew, or it may have arisen—as Wellhausen suggests—from a confusion in translation of the Aramaic pronominal suffixes (-hon instead of -kon).

Matthew's form would appear to be closer to the original in word and tone: "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you" (5¹²). Here is the stimulus of a strong encouragement (cf. Lk 12³²) in view of the growing opposition of the religious leaders to the Master, which would come inevitably to the disciples in their turn.

3. We possess in the Sermon material another testimony to the fact that Jesus did not refrain from using language which might seem to echo just that commercial conception of religion which He so strenuously attacked. "Take heed," says Jesus, as He exhorts His followers to devote their single-minded efforts to the practice of the higher righteousness, "that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them: else ye have no reward with your Father who is in the heavens" (6¹). In other words, mere formalism and hypocrisy can expect no more than what is primarily desired, the applause of men.

As some of the Jews at least had come to feel, human praise and divine could hardly both be claimed, nor reward in the age to come as well as in the present life. Yet it is plainly not the reward itself to which Jesus really directs attention, but the new righteousness of unselfish service for its own sake: the recompense is partaking in the life of that Kingdom whose members will be of such a nature. Even from this warning on the negative side the motive is seen to be inward, and not to arise from any external attraction.

Our Lord lends no support to the belief in overflowing benefits from the stored treasures of the good deeds of the fathers: the striving is individual; so is the life which crowns it the designation of the individual aspect of the blessed experience of the subjects of the reign of God. The subsequent verses bear out this view. For secret alms—a chief form of righteousness—secret prayer, and secret fasting are alike described as being endued with the Father's future recompense (6⁴. 6. 18), as opposed to the already finished transaction wherein the incentive was merely popular approbation (2. 5. 16). Whether the divine boon consists in the secret joy of the rightly ordered life, or in a dramatically conceived open reward in the day of judgement—at the instance, it may be, of the Son of man's "confession" of the discipleship of the filially disposed—followed by a career blissful and deathless, does not appear. Nor does it matter: to those who seek divine beatitude, the life present contains within itself an earnest of its own reward.

4. Although it is nowhere stated in so many words that the dominant motive of the nobler righteousness is love—filial on the one side, brotherly on the other, yet this appears from two Lucan passages which include the idea of recompense. Looking for no human return, Jesus bids His own live the higher life for its own god-likeness, and enjoins for the second time (cf. 6²⁷, the sections probably having been taken consecutively from Q): "Love your enemies, and do good, and lend, never despairing, and your reward shall be great, and ye shall

be (what you will have manifested yourselves to be by spiritual kinship) sons of the Highest," in the glorious experience of the coming Kingdom (6³⁵; cf. Mt 5^{44ff.}, where the reward idea only appears in the subsequent expansion). Such sons of God too are the peacemakers in the beatitude (Mt 5⁹) worthy to be so named, who exhibit another aspect of love.

5. Again, in the collection of pictures and parables connected with a festive meal, our Lord is reported to have addressed His host on one occasion to the effect that he should invite such as could not recompense him with similar entertainment, and so "bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; because they have not wherewith to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just" (Lk 14^{13f.}), *i.e.* in the Messianic kingdom.

The prevalent limitation of resurrection to the fuller meaning, the rising to life, the divine act of raising the righteous to blessedness—which Jesus here apparently accepts—has been noted (p. 213 ff.) in dealing with the direct references to that subject.

The nature of the recompense is not discussed, but by its very contrast with any human return the promised reward is clearly spiritualised.

Once again the motive power is an outgoing love to fellow-men as such, children of the same heavenly Father, despite—and indeed increased in extent and warmth because of—their present impoverishment and physical disabilities.

6. Although Jesus inveighed against all mechanical and commercial conceptions of religious practice, yet He did not shrink, as we have just seen, from availing Himself of the imagery of Reward; but its use was confined to that of illustration, not enunciating it as a principle; of encouragement, not revealing it as an inward motive.

It is sufficient to add here, that the whole system of treating religion on a business basis—so much correct observance, so much divine indebtedness—was overthrown by the teaching of one at least of the parables, that of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mt 20^{1ff.}), which demonstrates that although devoted service is expected from each to fit him for the boon of the Kingdom, yet the divine gift is out of all proportion to the service of the individual, and is the same for all. It is not amount, but quality of effort in harmony with the Father's will and the Father's love, that matters. Indeed, the devoted effort is even compared with the relationship of a slave to his master (Lk 17¹⁰); there is no question of retribution or desert, but only of grace (cf. Ap Ez 8^{36. 39}). Here was "new teaching," bursting the wine-skins of the old language of Reward. No more was prosperity the token of divine recompense in this age, as was the prevalent OT opinion; no more could the bliss of the coming world be conceived, in the words of the wise, as "wages of holiness" and "a prize for blameless souls" (Wis 2²²). Here in truth the noblest religious ethics of His people were in harmony with the doctrine of Jesus, as tradition told of Antigonos of Socho, who said: "be

like slaves who minister to their master without the condition of receiving a reward" (Pirke Aboth 1³).

Yet we cannot be surprised that the glorious reward so broadly spoken of even in figure came to be delineated in detail by Christians oppressed with persecution as an offset to the dismal and trying gloom of their own contemporary surroundings, wherein much heartening was required. According to the general Jewish expectation, the blessedness of recompense was naturally only to be enjoyed fully after the great Judgement. Yet that the reward of the godly was regarded as coming to them to some extent at least immediately after death may be seen in passages like Wis 3^{1ff}, En 104^{1ff}, Jub 23³¹ etc., and presumably in Lk 16²². We may note also that from Persian religious teaching we gather that individual recompense was expected to be allotted "after three days" (*e.g.* *Vend.* 7, *Yasna* 43, *Yast* 22).

(*b*) *Treasure*.—If we have realised in some degree the strength and independence of the teaching of Jesus, we shall not be surprised to discover other metaphors from labour or wealth which our Lord did not shrink from using because of the possibility of their being misapplied. We must needs think Orientally, and we shall then be in less danger of falling into the errors of exegesis due to our Western unimaginative literalism.

1. We have already had cause to notice the wording of our Lord's behest to the rich man, as He bade him sell all his possessions and follow Him: "and thou shalt have treasure in heaven" (Mk 10²¹ ||).

In this place "treasure in heaven," *i.e.* with or before God, seems to signify "eternal life" or "the kingdom of God," only viewed from the special standpoint of this inquirer's own wealth: the figure, that is, has been called forth by and is suited to the occasion.

2. Within the same circle of ideas we have, in what is very probably Q material incorporated in the "great interpolation" of Luke, similar renunciation urged upon the disciples, in close relation with the "seeking" and the "giving" of the Kingdom in the previous verses.

"Sell that ye have, and give alms: make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not. . . . For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (12^{33f.}).

This contrast is perhaps a still more striking one: between earthly wealth, stored or buried beneath house-floor or field or kept in girdles of skin, according as it consists in vesture, jewels or coin, and treasure which is spiritual—service heavenward in aim, precious before God. An almost identically expressed instruction has been embedded by Matthew in the Sermon material subsequently to the teaching on the higher righteousness which is typified by the inwardly motivated almsgiving, prayer and fasting: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth . . . but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven . . . for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also" (6^{19ff.}). These slightly divergent traditions serve to authenticate an utterance of this nature but do not enable us to locate it in its correct context.

But we shall not greatly err if we suppose it to have been a metaphor used on more than one occasion to enforce the fact that entrance into the Kingdom was the supreme aim for each here and now, and, as was shown in the brief parables of the Treasure and of the Pearl, worth in its issue the sacrifice of all else to attain (cf. p. 81).

Now we observe that in His very use of this already familiar imagery our Lord corrects a prevalent error. The laying up of treasure with God had come (possibly under the influence of the Persian doctrine of individual reward) to be conceived of in a materialistic manner, *e.g.* "Thou layest up a good treasure for thyself" (Tob 4^{8f.}, also in connexion with almsgiving): "Bestow thy treasure according to the commandments of the Most High; And it shall profit thee more than gold" (Sir 29¹¹, similarly): and of the righteous it is said that their works are preserved or treasured before (lit. hang upon) the Lord of spirits (En 38²; cf. Gr Ap Bar 11).

The more spiritual view has been met with in Pss Sol.: "He that doeth righteousness treasureth up life for himself with the Lord" (9⁹); but the idea of exactly measured retribution emerges both in Ap Bar, where a treasure of the works of the righteous is stored in treasuries (14¹²), and, according to a later passage, their reward varies as the amount of such treasure (24¹); and also in Ap Ezra, where a treasure of their good works is stored for the reward of the righteous at the last day (7⁷⁷ 8³³, 36, 54). There is also a possible reading

in the Testaments: "Do righteousness, my sons, on earth, that ye may have (it) a treasure in heaven" (Levi 13⁵).

The treasuring of merits appears again and again in the later Jewish literature (*e.g.* bab Sabb 31^b, Ber Rabbah 9, bab Baba Bathra 11^a, etc.); but voices are raised against the ledger-account idea, as in the tale of King Munbaz or Monobazos in the last reference. We must remember that "heaven" is not a place of future abode as such, but signifies future blessedness just in so far as it means with God. Indeed, the terrible warning of the closing comment of Jesus upon the story of the Rich Fool illustrates this well: "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God" (Lk 12²¹).

Thus in the case of this imagery also we find the same root-principle of the doctrine of Jesus at work: that the whole test of man's probation in view of the Kingdom lies in the motive which is found to inspire life's conduct. To admit the human aspirant to the life of the coming age, everything entrusted to him—in these instances for the most part wealth—must be used for the glory of God and for the good of his fellows.

(*c*) *Joy*.—Another figure taken from human experience and applied especially in Luke to the blessed life in the coming Kingdom is that of Joy. The bright gladness which is a healthy reaction and a restorative to mortals has its spiritual counterpart with God. The references to such divine joy which come first to our minds are hardly of an eschatological nature, however, but simply picture the rejoicing of the Father at the

penitence of the sinner in human terms: "even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth" (Lk 15⁷, Lost Sheep); "there is (becomes) joy in the presence of the angels," etc. (10, Lost Coin; cf. 32, En 51⁴). Moreover, that the disciples' names are "written in heaven," known to God—assured, that is, in apocalyptic phraseology, of life in the divine Presence in the future age—is the true and valid ground of their present rejoicing (Lk 10²⁰; cf. Mk 4¹⁶, Mt 5¹²).

But the joy to be looked for in the coming age after single-minded service is perhaps best typified by "the joy of thy lord" in the Matthean parable of the Talents (25^{21, 23}), into which the faithful slave is to "enter" on his master's return. Thus there is a definitely eschatological application, the spiritual felicity of the Kingdom of God; although the prime lesson of the story, like that of the similar one of the Pounds (Lk 19^{12ff.}), is the full use of present opportunities and capacities for service.

The joy of the godly was a well-established feature associated with the time of, and after, the Resurrection and the Judgement; *e.g.* "The hearts of the holy were filled with joy, that the (completion of the) number of the righteous was nigh" (En 47⁴), while "joy and honour" are "prepared and inscribed" for the spirits of the righteous dead (103³¹), and such will "have great joy as the angels in heaven" (104⁴); in fact, the choric gladness and the shining radiance of the heavenly star-spirits form in this and other contexts the loftiest

conception available of the future blessedness of the righteous with God.

Thus Jesus in His intuitive Son-consciousness neither hesitates to ascribe joy to the Father, nor does He shrink from using earthly joy arising from devoted and faithful service as a suitable figure for the gladness of the sharers in the life of the coming age (cf. Gr Ap Bar 15).

But of the crude and ghastly delight which apocalyptic writers depicted and later Judaism re-echoed—the joy of the pious Jews at the tortures (*e.g.* Ap Ez 7⁹⁸; cf. En 48⁹) or perishing of the heathen, indeed, even the joy of God (^{60f.}) at the destruction of the wicked—there is no trace whatever in the lofty teachings of Jesus, and in His silence as well as in the unbroken positiveness of His exhortations lies the condemnation of any such conception as unworthy of a faith in an all-loving Father. The fanciful speculations of the more recent Midrashim serve as a very remarkable contrast to the sober reticence of our Lord on this subject (cf. Wünsche, *op. cit.* iii. 23 ff. etc.).

We may notice as a feature emblematic of this joy of the new age the Messianic meal (Mt 8¹¹ ||, Mk 14²⁵ ||, Lk 14¹⁵ 22³⁰), which afforded opportunity for many realistic descriptions of the gladness of the righteous, however the food of which they partook was interpreted, literally or mystically, in the apocalypses and later Midrashim; and in the heavenly feast the patriarchs (like the apostles) recline on the chief couches as the highest ministers of an earthly monarch (Mk 10³⁷ ||).

Closely associated too with this joy is the radiant glory of the godly (En 62^{16f.}, Ap Ez 7⁹⁷, Ap Bar 51¹⁰, Asc Mos 10⁹ etc.), who, as in the explanation of the parable of the Tares (Mt 13⁴³), shine like the sun; and, more than that, in subsequent speculative delineations of Paradise they join in the dance which God Himself leads.

We may compare also analogous Persian teaching about celestial joy (*Yasna* 62), food for the good souls (*Yast* 22), the glory of Saoshyant (19), and the endless lights of Paradise (12).

(d) *Salvation*.—Before we pass to what may be called the local appellations utilised to express the condition of the just after death, we must make some allusion to the term “salvation” and the cognate verb “save.” These are used by Luke in relating the episode of the tax-collector Zacchæus: “To-day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham” (19⁹), although his calling was despised and deemed accursed. Then a comment is added which, if authentic, applied primarily to Israel alone; or, if Lucan, referred to the Gentiles also, for whom he was writing: “For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost” (10). The coming is past and over. The only similar retrospect dealing with the purpose of the Son of man’s coming is in the “ransom” passage (Mk 10⁴⁵, Mt 20²⁸; cf. p. 109 ff.). If the future aspect of “salvation” be included at all in the words quoted above, it is at any rate only secondary and by implication; and the ensuing comment, however true as the

reflexion of the inward experience of unnumbered souls, does not fit the occasion.

We may compare the similar comment attached in later MSS. to 9⁵⁵: "For the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them" (cf. the addition to Mt 18¹⁰).

Salvation, in the eschatological sense of entering into the glorious Kingdom, sharing in the career of semi-material felicity in the new age, has already been brought before us briefly in the astonished question of the disciples after the retirement of the man with great possessions: "Who then can be saved?" (Mk 10²⁶ ||), and in the hearer's anxious inquiry: "Are there few that be saved?" (Lk 13²³), which was answered by the command of strenuous self-discipline and service (pp. 84 f., 222). The pious in the coming age were not frequently termed "saved" in contemporary literature; but we find in Enoch that "in the name of the Lord of spirits" the righteous "are saved" (48⁷), "all the elect will stand before him (Messiah) on that day" and "the righteous and elect will be saved on that day" (62^{8, 13}; cf. 51²); and in Ap Ezra: "He who survives . . . will be saved and will see my salvation and the end of my world" (6²⁵). The same thought finds expression in the saying, which may well have come from our Lord's lips, embedded in the "little apocalypse" chapter: "he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved" (Mk 13¹³ ||), *i.e.* after the preliminary woes enjoy the bliss of the Kingdom. The saving of the "soul" by the

man who loses it for Jesus' sake (Mk 8³⁵) is given a spiritualised eschatological application in the Fourth Gospel: "he that hateth his soul in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" (Jn 12²⁵). In this respect of salvation Ap Ezra and Ap Baruch represent respectively the narrow and the catholic outlook to be found alike within the Judaism of the first Christian century. The sad strain of the former work—"many are created, but few shall be saved," and in these God has His joy; they are few, like men's precious stones, for "this world has the Most High created for many, but the future only for few . . . many are created, but few saved" (7⁴⁷. 51f. 59ff. 81ff. 9¹⁵)—is rejected in Ap Baruch, *e.g.* "others not few have done aright" (21¹¹); and the practical response of our Lord to the inquirer as to the relative proportion of saved and lost bids us leave the matter in confident trust and apply ourselves to striving to attain fitness for our own citizenship in the divine realm. Salvation on the negative side, in the sense of freedom from an adverse verdict in the day of Judgement, is not unknown in the apocalypses (cf. Slav En 48⁹ 65⁸ 66⁷ etc.).

(ii) *Their Place of Abode*

Of the expressions reported as having been used by Jesus to designate the abode of the righteous departed we have three preserved, and each of them is found only in the record of Luke.

1. *Eternal Tabernacles*.—Our Lord is represented as giving the following practical counsel by way of com-

ment on the story of the Unrighteous Steward, which He had just told: "I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail"—that is, the wealth acquired on earth, at death—"they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles" (Lk 16⁹). The imagery of the phrase was doubtless suggested by the houses of the debtors into which the dismissed steward of the parable hoped to be received (⁴).

The term is colourless in itself, and yet the story calls forth the thought of the glad warmth of gratitude in the welcome from those bettered by our earthly service, if only we apply ourselves with the zeal which is directed to mundane enterprise for selfish ends.

The "eternal tabernacles" are for the "sons of light" (cf. En 108¹¹), and the inhabiting of them betokens the blissful state of the pious. The expression therefore has no gloomy pathos or accent of lament such as attaches to the "homes of eternity," the rock-hewn tombs.

A phrase in Enoch provides a striking contrast: "our soul," say the penitent sinners, "is sated with unrighteous mammon, but that hinders not that we wend our way into the flame of the pain of Sheol" (? 63¹⁰).

But the tabernacles or abiding-places of the world to come must have been familiar in popular religious language before our Lord's day. "I saw," says Enoch, "the dwellings of the holy and the resting-places of the righteous" (39⁴; cf. 71¹⁶). Again: "I saw his (Messiah's) dwelling under the wings of the Lord of spirits. All the

righteous and elect before him will be resplendent as the gleam of fire . . . for that dwelling-place my soul longed" (71¹); "there I saw the dwellings of the elect (that were to be) and the dwellings of the holy" (41²).

Slav Enoch likewise teaches that "in the world to come . . . are many mansions prepared for men; good for the good, evil for the evil, many and without number. Blessed are those that shall go to the mansions of the blessed" (61^{2t}, recalling Jn 14^{2t}; cf. also "I shall go to the highest heavens to my eternal habitations," 55²; "bright and incorruptible Paradise shall be their protection and their eternal habitation," 65⁹). Thus we have here but another instance of the utilising by our Lord of popular expressions as part of the setting of His teaching without raising or deciding any question as to their value or fitness as such. We may compare the prevalent conception in apocalyptic writings of the treasure-chambers for righteous souls before the last Judgement, met with especially in Ap Ez 4³⁵ etc., Ap Bar 21²³ etc.; and this idea constitutes a point of contact with the next appellation which we have to notice.

2. *Abraham's Bosom*.—Another popular title for the place of the blessed dead—generally supposed to mean before the great Judgement, although many regard it as implying a final state—is "Abraham's bosom," the term used in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The former, we are told, "seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom" (Lk 16²³). If the story is

recorded in close agreement with the words originally uttered, we are bound to admit that it apparently tends to accept if not to confirm the view current at a late stage of post-canonical development, that the waiting-place of souls for judgement—if that be depicted—was divided, and the pious and wicked alike had a foretaste of their final bliss or woe; and, as in this parable, neither penitence nor intercession then avails (cf. Slav En 42² 53¹). Whatever blessedness was allotted before the day of the great Judgement would naturally be possessed by Abraham and the patriarchs who were expected to rise first; and this was Paradise, in the intermediate sense. But seeing that it is not possible to construct a systematic belief out of the various phases and stages represented in Enoch (22), Ap Ezra (4^{35. 41} 7^{32. 75ff.}), Ap Baruch (30²), etc., with regard to the receptacles for souls and their experiences before the Judgement, it would be at least venturesome to lay any stress upon, or seek to satisfy a curiosity discouraged by Jesus by any inferences from, such occasional and merely pictorial detail used in His parabolic teaching.

3. *Paradise*.—The last term utilised to signify the abode of the departed is that recorded by Luke to have been on our Lord's lips when dying upon the cross, in the words uttered in response to the petition of the repentant robber: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (23⁴³). It must be admitted that the episode itself raises grave doubts as to the probability of its occurrence as it is narrated; not so much because of our

Lord's words as by reason of the unmatched faith of the robber beside Him.

Although we cannot speak with certainty, the prevailing belief appears to have been that the godly were received into their temporary abiding-places in that portion of the under-world of Sheol appointed for them (cf. Ps Sol 15^{10ff.}), in company with the righteous ones of the past of whom the patriarchs were chief. Besides the detailed scheme of division into separate sections, as described in Enoch 22, for different phases of reservation or of pain—according to the part played in life during the Maccabean struggles (cf. 2 Mac 7¹⁴)—we have more general evidence of current notions from the Similitudes, which tell of “the garden where the elect and the righteous dwell,” and of the “garden of the righteous,” and of dwelling “in the garden of life” or “of righteousness” (En 60^{8.23} 61¹² 77³), which was supposed to be located in the north-west, “where the angels took” for Enoch’s instruction “cords to measure the place for the elect and the righteous,” where also he “saw the first fathers and the righteous who from the beginning dwell in that place” (70^{3f.}). These passages seem to regard the “Gan ‘Eden” as a temporary Paradise for all such—even for the holiest—until the day of divine judgement (cf. bab Ber 28^b). On the other hand, primitive Christian belief and some of the Jewish apocalypses identify Paradise with heaven, or more strictly the heaven in which God dwells. For the former, we may refer to the description of the rapt

vision of the first martyr, as he "saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God" (Ac 7⁵⁵). As to the latter, we may turn to Slav Enoch, according to which the tree in the midst where God rests is in the third heaven, where also is the inmost court of angels (cf. the heaven of heavens, En 71⁵), and whence flow the life-giving streams; here the suffering and loving righteous will abide (8 f.). Upon this the garden of rest for the righteous opens forth, and to it Adam and the patriarchs will be led out finally from Sheol to joy and light and life eternal (42^{3ff.}), and in it from Eden the dwellers therein see the angels singing (31²). Again, Ap Ezra seems to take the heavenly Paradise as the final abode of bliss; for it is opposite the furnace of Gehenna (recalling Lk 16²³), and provides eternal and healing fruits (7^{36. 123}), while it has long been prepared with its tree of life and with blessedness and repose for the righteous alone (8⁵²). Such a belief, that Paradise—even if used of the abode of the just previous to the Judgement—signifies the eternal home with God for the faithful who overcome, is shared among many others by the writer of the NT Apocalypse (2⁷), and, presumably, by St. Paul (2 Cor 12⁴). The Petrine address after Pentecost, however, assumes, as do the Christian creeds later, a temporary abiding of Jesus in Sheol (on the basis of Ps 16) before exaltation to be "both Lord and Christ" at God's right hand (Ac 2^{31ff.}). So too in the Talmud all the dead await the Resurrection in Sheol (*e.g.* bab 'Erubin 54^a), and yet it is also

held that the souls of the just remain beneath the throne (bab Sabb 152^b).

Amidst such divergences of view and intermingling of conceptions about the abode of the blessed called Paradise and kindred names, whether regarded as temporary or permanent, we can only be glad and grateful that Jesus thought fit to provide no guidance to thread a certain way ; but rather directed His hearers by the urgent and practical nature of His teaching to strive in devoted service towards God and man—inspired throughout by the motive of love—and to leave the issue, the quality and circumstances of the felicity of the sharers in the Kingdom, to the Father's will in childlike trustfulness.

So in the last two passages which we have been discussing from the third Gospel, the value of the purely religious idea—the certainty of divine retribution in the one case, and the certainty of divine (and human) communion in the other—is quite independent of either the adequacy or the correctness of the contemporary materialistic and spatially conceived expression of it. And yet speculation as to these and other undefined terms has gone on through the generations of the Fathers and the age of the Schoolmen, and continues still, unsatisfied and unsatisfiable ; a playground for religious fancy, sometimes harmful, sometimes harmless, yet ever unprofitable ; because it deals with a subject upon which no open teaching has been given to us, and which transcends, and always must while we are on the earthly plane transcend, human experience.

CHAPTER VI

JUDGEMENT AND ITS ISSUES

A. DIRECT INSTRUCTION

WHEN we turn from the revelation of Life and consequent immortality which Jesus gave for those who accepted His message and thus became fitted to enter or receive the Kingdom to the information which the records of His teaching afford us as regards the fate of the unfit, we discover that the Marcan narrative has no direct and clear allusion to eschatological or final judgement.

1. The most that we can say is that reference to ultimate condemnation may be included in the following passage of warning against the scribes, which Mark and Luke report, and which is incorporated in the great Matthean denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees.

“And in his teaching he said, Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and (to have) salutations in the market-places, and chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts: they which devour widows’ houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; these shall receive greater condemnation” (Mk 12^{38ff.}).

In the other evangelists the position of the utterance is the same, after the question about the Messiah being "the son of David."

Matthew (23⁶), however, does not represent Mk 12⁴⁰, which directly mentions the proportionately greater condemnation; but later MSS. added a recension of the verse as another reason for the woe of 13, "these" being replaced by "ye" (A.V. 14). Luke in his account defines the audience: "And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples"; and inserts the verb "love" before "salutations," and also "chief seats in the synagogues" before the same at feasts (20^{45ff.}).

He has also the reference to their fondness for chief seats and salutations applied to the Pharisees as a doublet among the woes in the "interpolated" material (11⁴³). The word used here (*πρίμα*) by Mark and Luke alike is not applied to final judgement in any of the Gospels; even its occurrence in the fourth: "for condemnation came I into this world" (9³⁹), refers rather to a present differentiation amongst men according to their attitude to the personal revelation. Moreover, the terms of the deduction are very general in expression.

2. There is in the next place a passage, presumably from Q, in the midst of the Sermon material, which refers by implication to divine judgement, and that in the indirect and reverential passive form. Here final judgement of an adverse nature may be included in the comprehensive statement. Matthew has the simpler tradition: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For

with what judgement ye judge (*sc.* men), ye shall be judged (*sc.* by God): and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you" (7¹¹). Luke either elaborates considerably or does not compress his authority; for he has in addition to the first sentence above a parallel expression: "and condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned" (*καταδικασθῆτε*, a terminology which appears in the Matthean addition, 12³⁷). He continues with a fuller report of practical counsel: "release, and ye shall be released: give, and it shall be given unto you"; and then exhibits vivid imagery from Oriental wheat-selling: "good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, shall they give into your bosom. For with what measure," etc. (6^{37f.}). Of these concluding words of the passage in both Gospels Mark appears to have a reminiscence in another context (4²⁴).

The saying as a whole was evidently not regarded as being of an eschatological type by Luke, but as dealing entirely with the amenities of human intercourse. The closing words, which have entered into the three Gospels, recall the Jewish parallel: "What measure a man measures, others measure to him" (*bab Sanh 100^a*). This second quotation does not supply us any more than the preceding one with a stable basis for inferences about the final judgement of the ungodly.

3. More profitable material for our quest appears to be provided by the various passages concerning "that day," or "the (day of) judgement" represented by both Matthew and Luke, and probably derived from Q.

Such expressions are to be found frequently both in apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature. The first saying of this type in Matthew's order is: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name?" etc. (7²²). This has its virtual parallel, but in a different context, in "then shall ye begin to say, We did eat and drink in thy presence," etc. (Lk 13²⁶), which is appended to matter relating to the "narrow" and the "shut" door (24f.). Here, quite apart from the subsequent words (23 = Lk 13²⁷) it is Matthew only who gives an obviously eschatological time-definition.

On the other hand, the expression "that day" signifies in Mark the occasion of the bridegroom's violent withdrawal (2²⁰); in Luke the time of persecution (6²³), the period of doom for Jerusalem (17³¹), as well as the end, and that according to the evangelist's context in a universal sense (21^{34f.}). The question which the first utterance quoted suggests as to whether Jesus spoke of Himself as the pronouncer of adverse sentence upon the "doers of iniquity" (Mt 7²³, Lk 13²⁷) has been dealt with relative to the title Son of man (p. 162 f.).

4. Again, in the instruction to "the twelve" and in Luke's variant charge to "seventy others," after the description of the essential content of their teaching, we have the terrible warnings upon those cities which had been especially favoured by the personal ministry of Jesus; and, according to the Lucan compilation, upon such as did not receive His emissaries. First, Chorazin and Bethsaida, cities of His home-land, are warned by

name of their doom, although we know nothing otherwise of the Master's ministration therein. It may have been one unaccompanied by any disciples; yet our ignorance in this case as in others may serve to exhibit the scantiness of our records for large spaces in our Lord's activity "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which were done in you, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes" (Mt 11²¹, Lk 10¹³: identical, but for "sitting" being absent from Matthew). "Howbeit, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgement, than for you" (Mt ²² supplies an introductory "I say unto you," and has "the day of judgement"). The subsequent declaration of the coming degradation of Capernaum is identically reported, but Matthew (²³) attaches here the expansion (cf. 10¹⁵) to the effect that had Sodom had the same opportunities "it would have remained until this day." In the third Gospel one of the self-identifications of Jesus with His disciples follows (10¹⁶; cf. Mt 10⁴⁰).

Now Luke, it will be observed, definitely reorientates these passages at the outset, by making the warning words refer to the cities evangelised by the missionaries of Jesus, who, if rejected, were to wipe the dust off their feet (10¹¹), just as Paul and Barnabas did at Antioch (Ac 13⁵¹). Of such places Jesus is represented as speaking: "I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city" (Lk 10¹²). But this

warning of the doom of final judgement on city populations, although attached in the same position in our Matthew, fits ill with the house-visitation instructions which precede in both Gospels, and with the merely preparatory sojourn—which seems to belong to the original charge—of two disciples previous to the Master's personal visit which was to follow immediately, unlike the protracted stay of Jesus involved by Matthew's introduction to the "city" woes (11²⁰). Nor can we be at all surprised if later Church experience should be reflected in the transmission of these rules for itinerant evangelists. But we must notice that Matthew has another warning derived from the fate of Sodom, with reference to the city last named by him, Capernaum: "Howbeit, I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgement, than for thee" (11²⁴). This, except for "the day of judgement" instead of "that day," is identical with the concluding verse of the instruction in Luke just mentioned above. Further, it appears again—whether from Q or inserted from the Lucan recension—as an unsuitable addition, breaking the continuity of the instruction on the question of hospitality, in Mt 10¹⁵, at the close of the charge to the Twelve, with the inclusion of Gomorrah, as well of the harmonising link "or that city" in the previous verse, and the substitution of "that city" (as Lk 10¹²) for "thee" (*i.e.* Capernaum, as Mt 11²⁴). These variations of position and of wording only serve to corroborate the existence in the common source of an illustrative warn-

ing or warnings from the fate of Sodom of which the *ipsissima verba* relating to the final "day" of judgement cannot be fixed with exactitude: nor can we be astonished, when they could be applied so readily to the later circumstances of extending Jewish-Christian missionary experience.

5. Closely related to the woes upon those cities which had been scenes of the continuous working of our Lord are the verses which allude to the adverse testimony of representatives of bygone generations to the conduct of His contemporaries who had enjoyed the privilege of His teaching in their midst. The same original is reproduced almost verbally in Matthew and Luke. "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, a greater than (πλεῖστον) Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it," etc. (Mt 12⁴¹, Lk 11^{32, 31} reverses the order probably to gain due chronological sequence, and substitutes the "men of this generation . . . them." Yet this change raises the suspicion that ³² has been added later).

It will have been remarked that here Matthew has "in the judgement" (cf. Ap Ez 7⁷³), evidently signifying the day of final assize, which otherwise he represents by "the day of judgement" (11^{22, 24} = 10¹⁵, and 12³⁶ to be set forth directly; cf. Ap Ez 7³⁸). Now, the new thought, the "new doctrine," in these places appears

to be this: instead of the picture of the Jews glorying over the condemnation of the Gentiles against whose oppression they had testified before God and sued for vengeance—which was a popular scene in the apocalyptic drama—men and women of alien race would be able to afford accusing witness against the present generation, because of its indifference to exceptional opportunities.

6. We have to consider briefly the other Matthean allusion to the day of judgement. After the charge of collusion with evil powers and the analogies of good fruit and good treasure and their opposites, Matthew adds verses (12^{36f.}) which are either unknown to or for some reason omitted by Luke. “And I say unto you, that every idle word (ῥῆμα) that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in (the) day of judgement. For by thy words (λόγοι) thou shalt be justified (δικαιωθήσῃ), and by thy words thou shalt be condemned” (καταδικασθήσῃ). This illustrative warning about the evil things from the human heart (^{34f.}; Lk 6⁴⁵) has clearly nothing directly to do with the previous context concerning the malicious charge of our Lord’s opponents, but has become appended if not from Q, then from some unconnected traditional sayings belonging, if authentic, to another occasion.

At any rate it is one more example of the habit of the first evangelist—and naturally of compilers and more especially catechists before him—to link together reported utterances associated by a similar thought or expression. The second verse (³⁷), which is attached to

supply a reason for the admonition, without being a real explanation thereof, relates to human converse (at least in its Greek dress) and recalls the phrase of the psalmist of penitence: "that thou mightest be justified in thy words" (51⁴; cf. Sir 5¹³). According to later Judaism, indeed, speaking evil of the Law or of a co-religionist merits the punishment of Gehenna (*e.g.* bab Sabb 33^a; Midr. Kohen ap. Wünsche, *op. cit.* 194; cf. Aboth 1¹⁷ etc.).

Words are assuredly the vehicle of thought and a touchstone of character, but there is no hint otherwise in the Gospels of such constituting the ground of final judgement. Contrast, for example, Matthew's own peculiar and transforming addition to the prediction of the Son of man's glorious coming: "and then shall he render unto every man according to his doing" (16²⁷, quoting Ps 62¹², Prov 24¹²); or again, "the doers of iniquity" (13⁴¹), or the test of mutual ministering (25³⁵). The most that we can assert with safety is that some warning against hasty and wicked words came from our Lord's lips, as His teaching to check unrighteous anger (Mt 5^{22ff.}) would suggest, and reminiscences thereof were known to the evangelist, and have been attached or added in this connexion. The detail in the parable picture: "out of thine own mouth will I judge thee" (Lk 19²²) is not really parallel in thought; although the approval or blame of the slaves in the story is susceptible of an eschatological application. The idea that final condemnation is based on occasional and thoughtless expressions in ordinary converse is not only

without support elsewhere, but is alien to the spirit of our Lord's teaching, which lays stress throughout on principles and inner motives, and not on momentary lapses in detail, as forming the basis of divine judgement. This was normally regarded by later Jews also as being according to works (bab Sotah 3^b, Aboth 6⁹), good and evil being weighed (cf. En 41² 61⁸), and diverse opinions were entertained as to the procedure for those whose deeds balanced (cf. Persian doctrine, *Vend.* 7, *Yasna* 33).

7. Leaving the thoughts of judgement which cluster round the conception of a day of divine assize we come to a striking fragment which both Matthew and Luke preserve, and which, unless transmitted independently, most likely had been contained in a slightly simpler form in Q; for Matthew places it after the question of the rich man, the comment on the danger of wealth, and St. Peter's eager inquiry as to what they should have, and immediately before the response given in Mk 10^{29f.}, Lk 18^{29f.} Luke, however, for reasons unknown to us, introduces it in quite another context, after the disputing of the disciples and the subsequent instruction on true service, which follow his partially duplicated account of the Last Supper.

The third evangelist also in his characteristic way exhibits his own style in the manner of phrasing our Lord's introduction of the promise: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations (cf. St. Paul's experience, as expressed Ac 20¹⁹); and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me

(cf. 12³²), that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (22^{29f.}; cf. the patriarchal rule expected in the ideal kingdom, Test Jud 25¹¹).

The change of mood renders the original unity of this utterance doubtful.

In Matthew the well-remembered promise, which recalled the ambitious desires of the sons of Zebedee (Mk 10^{37ff.}), was brought in by words which blended Semitic and Greek thought: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration (*παλιγγενεσία*; cf. "the laver of re-birth," Tit 3⁵; the apocalyptic renewal of creation, *e.g.* Ap Ez 7⁷⁵ 13^{25f.}, Ap Bar 32⁶ 57²; the Persian restoring of the world, *Yast* 19; and the Rabbinic new creation or renewal of the age, *e.g.* bab Sanh 97^b, etc.) when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (19²⁸; cf. the thrones for the spirits of the good, En 108¹²).

Now, on the face of it this is a different kind of "judging": it is rather, according to the attachment of the clause in Luke, sharing in the authority of the Kingdom, in glory, leadership and administration, than conducting a court of final assize; although to the Eastern mind share in rule would include participation in what we should call judicial functions. Even in Matthew, where the idea of the Son of man as the Judge is introduced, and in accordance with the tendency of that record the office of the original

apostles enhanced, the Twelve become but assessors to their glorified Lord, when He rules and by implication exercises judicial authority. In this case the Lucan transmission seems to represent the simpler and less developed form of the traditional saying; while, on the other hand, the manner of introducing the utterance in Matthew, although elaborated by the apparently borrowed (Hellenistic) conception of rebirth, and the prominence given to the administrative and judicial prerogatives of the Son of man, yet enshrines what may have been the original connecting thought of "following" or discipleship which led to some such expression as to the apostles having a share in authority in the coming Kingdom in relation to their own people. The limitation of the elect to Israel is noteworthy.

There appears to be nothing against the authenticity of some such heartening utterance in face of certain persecution, although it stands alone. Doubtless the exact form and the prefacing of such a saying would tend to be changed in accordance with the developing conception of the Judgeship of "the Lord," and with the growing respect—stimulated by apologetic needs—for the persons and office of the primitive apostolate. Nevertheless, in the position in which it is incorporated, the utterance is at least partially contradictory of the immediately preceding teaching in Luke and the immediately succeeding prediction in Matthew. But the very limitation of the authority to be exercised

to Israel stamps it as being true to the earliest Palestinian tradition, such as Q embodied. To Jews the apostles had proclaimed the Kingdom (Mt 10^{6, 23}); over such when the Kingdom came control in some sense would be bestowed upon them for their faithful companionship and service. The relation of this unique passage to the doctrine concerning the Kingdom of God and to that about the person and functions of the Son of man has been dealt with already (pp. 23, 155).

8. One of the verses just previous to our last instance of the Matthean expression "(the) day of judgement" contains a severely opprobrious term for our Lord's opponents: "Ye offspring of vipers" (12³⁴), which is similar to those in the collection of utterances denouncing the scribes and Pharisees; and indeed the words recur therein with a reference to final adverse judgement: "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgement of Gehenna" (23³³).

The same mode of address is reported by this evangelist to have been used in the Baptist's stern warning (supposed to have been uttered on that occasion to the Pharisees and Sadducees in surprise at their presence: "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (3⁷). It was just this divine wrath that would issue in a sentence of doom. But when we turn to the Lucan parallel of the woes against the Pharisees we find that he has no record of this severe verse—or omits it because he felt it unsuitable and liable to be misunderstood by

his readers, but passes from the witness of that generation against their own forefathers by building the tombs of the prophets (11^{47f.}) to the decision of "the wisdom of God" to send prophets "and apostles" whose blood also would be required of "this generation" (49^{ff.}). The peculiar evidence of the first Gospel makes the compiler's antipathy to the Pharisaic party an established fact; and this feeling would presumably meet with responsive sympathy in the Jewish-Christian communities for which he wrote.

If we are to believe that an utterance of this bitter severity came from Jesus Himself, the absence of it from Luke's group of sayings on the same subject and the fact that Mt ³⁶ and Lk ^{50f.} agree that the warning refers to a doom primarily political coming on that generation taken together render it at least fairly assured that the specially eschatological turn, "escape the judgement of Gehenna" (cf. bab Sabb 118^a, bab Ber 61^a), is due to the phrasing of the first evangelist; and that the original reference was to an imminent national catastrophe, which the compiler himself seems to have perceived in that he attached the lament over Jerusalem's fate thereto (37^{ff.}). This last, however, is located much earlier by Luke in answer to a personal warning received from "certain Pharisees" during the time that Jesus was "journeying on unto" the Holy City (13^{34f.}; cf. 22. 31).

9. There is a reference to "the judgement" also on the occasion when our Lord was establishing and

deepening the value of the old law about murder, while at the same time He widened greatly its application. "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgement; but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement" (Mt 5^{21f.}). Probably in laying down in hyperbolical language the principle that the law of murder applied to the control of all ebullitions of wrath, although homicide might not be the outcome in act, our Lord was taking up the traditional inference from the commandment and extending its range, without any directing of the hearers' thoughts either to the judgement which was expected to usher in the coming age or to the final assize at the close of the Messianic kingdom. In Matthew, however, two other sayings follow, which, as they stand, represent a climax in punishment but not in guilt.

If they were originally uttered connectedly, we have lost the proper significance of their bold and paradoxical emphasis: if they were not thus spoken, the inconsistency of sequence may be due to Matthew's grouping of disconnected sayings. There is possibly an allusion to current contemporary detailed grading of sins of speech, and consequent distinctions in religious penalty under the authority of local or central tribunal. But even this does not come in suitably with the extension of the principle of the sixth commandment from cases of homicide to any uncontrolled anger, and thus leading

up from the negative aspect towards the positive fulfilment in the law of love and forgiveness (^{23f.}), because hatred however manifested is "in danger of," *i.e.* liable to and deserving of, "condemnation" both divine and human. The eschatological connexion appears therefore to be justifiable in so far as it is an inferential interpretation, but it is not primary.

B. INDIRECT TEACHING

(i) *The Abode of the Ungodly*

(a) *Gehenna*

It is necessary for us now to examine terms and phrases ascribed to Jesus which bear obvious reference to the abode and state of the ungodly and rejected after this life. The most familiar local appellation both in contemporary and later Judaism was probably Gehenna. Let us take the examples of the use of that term first.

1. There is no instance in the scanty records of teaching which are afforded by Mark except in that group of sayings which stands alone and refers to causes of stumbling for others and for oneself (9^{43. 45. 47}), which we found (p. 41) in two forms in Matthew—5^{29f.}, breaking the connexion of thought, and 18^{8f.}, in the same context as in Mark—but absent entirely from Luke; either because he had not the warnings in his sources, or because he passed them over as being too peculiarly Jewish in phraseology. All that concerns us here is to note the various expressions for the doom

of the offender, whether the terms refer to the final condition or to the temporary state before the Judgement—a question which is really immaterial, because they do not seem to have been regarded as differing in kind.

Mark has "thy two hands to go into Gehenna," with an explicatory (later) addition, "into the unquenchable fire" (43); "thy two feet to be cast into G." (45); "two eyes to be cast into G." (47), with the Isaianic appendage (66²⁴): "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." The more compressed Matthean form closes the imagery of dreadful doom differently: "two hands or two feet to be cast into the eternal fire, . . . two eyes to be cast into the G. of fire" (18^{8f.}; cf. 5²² 25^{41. 46}). The doublet in the first Gospel, which emphasises the physical loss as contrasted with a worse doom rather than the positive boon of "entering into life," has the words "and not thy whole body go into G. . . . and not thy whole body be cast into G." by way of expressing the preferable alternative to the preserving of hand and eye respectively (5^{30. 29}). From these slightly divergent traditions we may infer with some confidence that warnings such as these were transmitted and recorded at a very early time, and that our Lord used the current term Gehenna as one signifying the extreme divine condemnation, but affording thereby no clue as to how far He shared any special one of the contemporary views upon the ultimate fate of the wicked. He utilised the terminology of popular belief for an

ethical purpose, to increase the sense of the individual responsibility of each of the hearers. That brutal rejoicing of the pious discoverable in current writings over the sufferings and doom of the ungodly—which, although it reappeared again and again with but slight transformation in Christian and Muslim literature, is utterly repugnant to the modern religious mind—finds no support in the didactic allusions of Jesus. The gaps in our knowledge are great indeed, but as far as the narrations transmitted carry us we should judge that our Lord did not dilate upon the speculations of His people and of His age about the nature of the torments of the ungodly, but rather rendered such exercise of the religious imagination unnecessary by turning men's attention to the main issues of life by means of His positive and directive teaching.

2. If we turn next to the common non-Marcian source, we discover an assured reference to Gehenna in the collected instructions to the missionaries of Jesus in Matthew, and among the directions of encouragement to "his disciples" in the audience of an attentive throng according to Luke. The mode of introduction therefore differs: in the one the disciples are to be fearless in proclamation, for the divine judgement will be open (Mt 10^{26f.}); in the other, the revelation and the public proclaiming are spoken of in close connexion with a warning against Pharisaic hypocrisy (Lk 12^{1ff.}). The beautiful saying, so rich in teaching of tender love, concerning the sparrows follows at once in both

accounts; and then ensues the announcement of the reward of loyalty, which consists in the "confession" of His faithful ones before God. The form in Matthew appears to be closer to the original: "And be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy (cf. Mk 8³⁵) both soul and body in Gehenna" (10²⁸). Luke, feeling doubtless that such words were for the intimate legates of the Lord "first of all" (if we take ¹ in this way), opens: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid . . . and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into Gehenna; yea, I say unto you, Fear him" (12^{4f.}).

The evangelist trained in Greek modes of thought recoils from the conception of a slain or destroyed soul (cf. En 99¹¹ 108³), but has no desire to deny punishment after death, for he emphasises the monition by additional words. He could not well avoid using the specifically Jewish term here, without introducing some expression with heathen associations, but only in this place does he write it. In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, as we shall see, torments are localised in one portion of Hades (16²³); while Paradise, which receives the righteous and the forgiven (23⁴³), may be supposed to have been the other division thereof.

The burning or destroying of both souls and bodies of the wicked who were raised for their punishment was

one of the views of their fate current in contemporary Judaism: it met the craving for revenge on the part of the patriotic apocalyptist (*e.g.* En 48⁹ 54^{1ff.} 62^{11ff.}), and was not unknown in the Rabbinic schools (*e.g.* bab Rosh ha Sh 16^b 17^a).

Although we cannot even in this instance be certain of the literal words, the essential truth which is impressed is clear: that God alone is to be feared, His authority as the Judge is absolute, so that no human tyrant and—may we not infer it from what the utterance does not say?—no prince of evil need inspire terror in faithful hearts.

3. We have seen already that the Jewish symbolic name for the place of extremest doom is only to be found once in Luke, thrice in matter which does not seem to be of the originally Marcan type of narrative (thrice also in the Matthean parallels), while the remaining instances are peculiar to the first evangelist.

One is: "whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of (lit. into) the Gehenna of fire" (5^{22c}; cf. 18⁹ above). This is the third and worst punishment, as the text stands, allotted for the saying of "fool," apparently in the religious sense of impious, while the other degrees of penalty are for anger and for saying "raka" respectively.

If the contrast intended to be drawn is between divine and human judgement, we cannot say that any satisfactory solution of the verse has yet been found, because there is no corresponding development in the serious-

ness of the crimes involved. Divine judgement for words uttered recalls 12^{36f.} above (p. 260), also unique. If we regard 22^{bc} as unauthentic, we are in ignorance as to how or whence the clauses were appended; if we suppose them to be due to the evangelist's love for grouping sayings, we still know neither the context nor the occasion.

4. The other two occurrences are in the chapter of denunciations upon the Pharisees, which, although presumably known to Luke in their simpler Q form, would have no interest to his Gentile readers.

One of the sayings reads: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of Gehenna than yourselves" (23¹⁵). This refers apparently to the zeal of the Pharisees in gathering adherents to their own stricter form of legal piety, rather than to an eagerness for making converts to Judaism as such. We are indeed reminded of the persecuting zeal of Saul the Pharisee; but that does not necessitate the hypothesis that it is an anti-Pauline addition to the woes which are sufficiently attested in the main by Luke's report of them, although this one he does not record. "Son of Gehenna," to us a terrible expression, was most probably current coin in contemporary speech; for it is met with later on, and contrasts well with "the sons of the kingdom" (18¹² 13³⁸), and with the Rabbinic term of approbation, "son of the age to come" (bab Rosh ha Sh 17^a, bab Ber 57^a).

5. The last example runs: "how shall ye escape the judgement of Gehenna?" (23³³). As we have already noticed (p. 265), this does not occur in Luke, and it recalls the severity of the Baptist's terrible warning (3⁷). This seems to be in strange disagreement with the liability—if that be authentic—to the punishment of "the Gehenna of fire" (5^{22c} above) for the use of merely an irreligious term for a fellow Israelite. This is but a perverse expression; the other manifests a perverted aim in life, and such persisted in by men who are taken as representative of their generation merits divine condemnation.

(b) *Hades*

Another local term which appears in utterances ascribed to our Lord, with or without implication of condemnation or torment, is Hades.

It is at least not very likely that this Hellenistic name for Sheol would fall from our Lord's lips; although it was familiar enough to Greek-speaking Jews, as may be realised not only from its usage in the LXX, but also from its occurrence in later apocalyptic writings such as the Sibyllines (3⁴⁵⁸ 5¹⁷⁸) and the Greek Baruch (4⁴ 5²), as well as in early Christian literature and interpolations.

1. In the discourse material of Q we have the term used with reference to Capernaum, the centre of the Galilean ministry, succeeding the woes on other cities. Matthew writes: "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt go down unto Hades"

(11²³). Luke has instead "be brought down," a reading well attested for Matthew also, but the other appears preferable (10¹⁵).

The verses in Luke, however, are not strictly in place, nor, as we saw (p. 258), do they really suit the occasion of a missionary instruction to the "seventy others," while ¹⁶ follows on ¹¹ very well.

Matthew adds here the comment that Sodom, had it been privileged to witness such "mighty works," would not have been guilty of so great indifference (^{23b} = 10¹⁵). Since it had been "his own city," a worse fate must befall Capernaum. With such dramatic personification in language reminiscent of Isaiah's bold picture of the doom of Babylon (14^{13ff.}) we have prophetic imagery of completest degradation and oblivion, imagery which proved to be justified historically in both cases. The evil condition is expressed in terms of locality—Sheol as the lowest depths of earth; but the language has nothing whatever to tell us of the age to come, that is of the eschatological outlook of Jesus. Yet words of denunciation like these on unrepentant cities and their unreceptive inhabitants would have an abiding freshness and would suggest reiterated application in the missionary experiences of the early itinerant apostles, prophets and evangelists.

2. The other instances of the use of the word are due either to the individual Gospel-writer or to the source which he employed.

In Luke the so-called parable of the Rich Man

depicts how "in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom" (16²³). Here again a differentiating of the lot of men after death is part of the furniture of the story (cf. Test Asher 6^{4f.}; and the Persian view, *Yast* 22, etc.); although there is nothing to emphasise the accuracy or the reverse of the popular belief which is utilised for a practical and religious end. We may remark in passing that in Ap Ezra likewise retributive pain commences after death, and the intercession of the just is deemed unavailing (7^{80. 105}). The separation of Sheol into different compartments with foretaste—unless the picture be of final condition (cf. En 103^{7f.})—of bliss or woe for those gathered therein seems to be accepted also in Lk 23⁴³, if Paradise there be equivalent to Abraham's bosom in this passage, symbolising the abode of the righteous. It must be noted again that the mere adopting of current imagery does not involve any revelation as to the literal truth of that imagery, but only testifies to its validity for the special purpose for which it is used, that is to furnish one of the mental pictures of the story. In other words, the least that we must admit is that Jesus accepted popular beliefs as instruments to enforce the lessons which He desired to teach.

3. The other occurrence is in Matthew only, in that peculiar section so prolific in controversy between the confession of St. Peter and the first suffering-prediction: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art 'Petros,' and upon this 'petra' will I build my church; and the gates

of Hades (cf. Ap Ez 4⁷) shall not prevail against it" (16¹⁸). The present writer cannot persuade himself that the fragment which contains this verse is part of an authentic record, though it may be genuine as far as the first Gospel is concerned.

Into the strife of words about it there is no need to enter here.

Even supposing the saying to have been uttered at some period before the close of the drama at Jerusalem concerning a congregation of His followers, the meaning could only be that its permanence was assured—such was His supreme confidence in His mission; stronger than Sheol, which none had forced, that is, to escape therefrom, although the expression came to be regarded later as synonymous with all the spirit-powers of evil in opposition to the Church.

(ii) *Figures of the Condition of the Condemned*

We have just examined the occurrence of place names which refer to the abode of the wicked after death and judgement: we must now direct our attention to expressions which allude to the condition of the same.

(a) *Destruction*.—1. The idea of destruction is the first which we meet with in this respect in the Marcan record; not indeed connected with words of our Lord, but as the interpretation of what was probably in fact an inarticulate cry of the "possessed" in the synagogue at Capernaum: "art thou come to destroy us?" (Mk 1²⁴, Lk 4³⁴).

We are reminded of the question of the Gadarenes according to Matthew's form of the story: "art thou come hither to destroy us before the time?" (8²⁹). Such expressions may not be admitted as evidence for our Lord's teaching; but they bear witness to a belief reflected in the sources or by the evangelists that the evil spirits afflicting men, spirits related in legend to the fallen angels (*e.g.* En 16¹), would suffer condemnation and torture in the day of judgement at "the great consummation"; and not they alone, but also apostate men (45²).

2. The same verb is used in the phrase already quoted in the last section, "destroy both soul and body in Gehenna" (Mt 10²⁸), when attention was drawn to the fact that the thought of destruction or annihilation of a soul, which did not present difficulties to a Jew (*e.g.* Asc Is 4¹⁸, Ap Bar 30^{4f.}; cf. later, body destroyed and soul burnt, bab Rosh ha Sh 16^b 17^a), would be unacceptable to the mind of the Greek physician.

3. Again, we find it in Matthew's collection of sayings on the subject of "little ones," whether children or humble disciples: "Even so it is not the will of (θέλημα ἑμπροσθεν) your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish" (ἀπόληται, 18¹⁴).

Here the thought is not primarily eschatological; but eternal loss is within the range of the application of the figure suggested by the Lost Sheep just previously (12^t). Yet this unveils nothing to us concerning the actual fate which such "perishing" implies.

Indeed, unlike the completeness of destruction which the idea of annihilation conveys to us, to later Judaism at least these terms were used in a very elastic manner; for the ungodly were often regarded as being destroyed (body and soul being reunited before judgement, *bab Sanh* 91^b 108^b) and revived, to be destroyed again, and so on.

There is a saying which is recorded on more than one occasion, and which is applied sometimes to final doom, but that was not the primary intention.

In the Marcan transmission it reads thus: "Who-soever would save his soul (*i.e.* life) shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his soul for my sake and the gospel's shall save it" (8³⁵; cf. the Johannine adaptation, 12²⁵). The other evangelists report the saying in the same connexion; only omitting "and the gospel's" (Mt 16²⁵, Lk 9²⁴). A doublet, presumably from Q, is to be found in Matthew, in the charge to the Twelve (10³⁹), while its position in Luke is among the instructions concerning escape from the city; in this recension the balancing clauses have "seek to gain" and "preserve" (*ζωογονήσει*) respectively (17³³). Although we may be unable to place the utterance with certainty, it is evident that the original connexion was with the courage which was needful for the primitive emissaries of Jesus, and the application of the warning to the early Christian missionaries in time of trial would follow very naturally. Nevertheless, the saying, however magnificent ethically and effective for missionary

momentum, does not add to our knowledge of the Lord's outlook upon the future on its darker side.

4. Once the noun occurs in a modification of the familiar Jewish teaching about "the two ways," but only in Matthew: "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction (*ἀπώλεια*), and many there be that enter in thereby" (7¹³). This is contrasted with the way leading to life (¹⁴), and therefore destruction is virtually identical with hell; although Luke's version of the saying does not depict the fate of those who fail so precisely or so gloomily, when he records it in answer to the inquiry about the number of the saved: "Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be capable of doing so" (*οὐχ' ἰσχύουσιν*, 13²⁴).

In Jewish apocalyptic, resurrection from "destruction" to judgement is met with, *e.g.* En 51¹, where it is almost synonymous with Sheol; Ap Bar 42⁷, where it, like life and the dust, relinquishes its temporary inhabitants. Yet destruction, like Gehenna, is regarded as the "heritage of sinners" (Pss Sol 15^{11ff.}); the end of the ungodly (Test Zeb 10³); the doom of the heathen peoples (Jub 15³¹), and so forth (cf. Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, 270 ff.).

(*b*) *Punishment*.—Related to the ideas of destruction and torment is that of "punishment," of the use of which term there is but one instance recorded, and that is at the conclusion of the scene of the pronouncing of sentence which forms the climax of the last group of parables in Matthew.

Like "destruction" (7¹³), it is contrasted with "life": "And these shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life" (25⁴⁶). Although this expression does not necessarily signify age-lasting pain, torture and suffering, yet one is conscious of a suspicion that the author of the first Gospel meant to imply it; despite the fact that the modern man like the spiritually minded among the Talmudists, ethically more sensitive than the Jew of the first century, recoils from the idea with horror. We find that this is a trait especially prominent in, if not peculiar to, this evangelist (cf. 13^{42. 50} 25⁴¹). Such thirst and even prayer for vengeance upon the wicked and the oppressors in the age to come was not felt to be incompatible with a piety which longed for the redemption of Israel; *e.g.* En 22¹¹, where our term occurs in the phrase "punishment and torture for the cursed for ever" (cf. for the finality of such doom, 25⁴, Ap Bar 44¹⁵ 85¹²); and Slav En., where the punishment is immeasurable (40^{12f.}), and the sinful "always suffer in the eternal life" (42²), nor can they "escape punishment in the great judgement forever" (60⁴).

For the connexion of punishment with destruction as preliminary thereto, reference may be made to En 80⁸ 106^{15. 17}; and for punishment regarded as torment (Lk 16^{23f.}), actual or foreseen, cf. Ap Ez 7^{36. 84. 87} 85⁹, bab Sanh 108^b, etc.

(c) *Fire*.—Of the torture and punishment temporary or final a favourite symbol among the Jews, from the late close of the roll of the prophet Isaiah onwards, was

"fire." It was not only an instrument of judgement, but also symbolic of the circumstances of the condemned. Incidentally, some of the synoptic allusions have been quoted already in connexion with Gehenna and Hades; but they must be recalled briefly now that we are considering fire as typical of the condition of the ungodly beyond death.

1. In that group of sayings which deals with "scandals" arising from a man's bodily members, and which has been incorporated from discourse material in Mark as well as in Matthew, we find the characteristic condition of the wicked designated as fire. In Mark there is the descriptive addition to "into Gehenna" of the words "into the unquenchable fire" (9⁴³); the Isaianic (66²⁴) clauses are appended: "where their worm dieth not (cf. En 46⁶), and the fire is not quenched" (4⁸; cf. Jud 16¹⁷, Sir 7¹⁷); and fire seems to supply the point of connexion with the following verse: "every one shall be salted with fire." In the Matthean doublet, however, no mention of fire appears; but in the parallel passage we have both "eternal fire" and "the Gehenna of fire" (cf. Ap Ez 7³⁶) to express the locality of the doom. In these cases such destiny is contrasted with the blissful condition of those who shall have entered into life or the Kingdom of God, which is synonymous therewith.

2. Again, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the story speaks of him as "being in torments," and saying: "I am in anguish in this flame" (Lk 16²⁴; cf.

Ap Ez 8⁵⁹). In the imagery of the narrative the fire appears to be conceived as material, and yet never burning in the sense of consuming. We are reminded of the Enochic phrase: "descending . . . into the flame of the pain of Sheol" (? 63¹⁰). Although the purpose of the story has nothing to do with giving information or correcting speculation upon the state of the righteous or of the ungodly after death, unless the final future be supposed to be visualised, the apparently contemporary and popular view of an intermediate condition subsequent to preliminary individual judgement at death would seem to be adopted.

3. The remaining passages in which fire is mentioned are of doubtful authenticity, and peculiar also to the record of the first evangelist. In the interpretation of an allegorical nature which is given for the parable of the Tares we are told that "the doers of iniquity" shall be cast by the Son of man's angels "into the furnace of fire" (13⁴²; cf. ³⁰, Ap Ez 7³⁶); and in the explanation of the brief similitude of the Net we learn likewise that the angels will separate the wicked, and "cast them into the furnace of fire" (⁵⁰). Here the current apocalyptic conception taken over is one such as is found in Enoch, who "saw a deep valley with blazing fire," and arch-angels entrusted with authority to "cast" the hosts of Azazel "into the burning furnace of fire" because they had been in Satan's service (54^{1, 6}).

4. This leads us to the last reference, which is at the close of Matthew's vivid judgement-scene: "Then shall

he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared"—not primarily for sinners amongst men, but for the introducers and encouragers of sin—"for the devil and his angels" (25⁴¹, in contradistinction to the pre-existent kingdom prepared for the righteous, ³⁴). The contrasted destinies are repeated at the end of this pictorial peroration (⁴⁶), but "eternal fire" is there replaced by "eternal punishment," already noticed above. Plenty of illustrative passages and references may be discovered for these conceptions of separation and of fire in the apocalyptic and in later Jewish literature.

The separation is a constant feature, whether the existence of the wicked thereafter be conceived as temporary (Sim En.) or enduring (as in Pss Sol., Slav En., etc.).

So, too, fire is the most frequently used figure for the doom of the unrighteous, and the chief characteristic of Gehenna: such is the place of the condemned, where extremes of heat and cold are endured, and that is the eternal inheritance prepared for them (Slav En 10).

Into the abyss of fire, temporary or final, the evil angels are cast at the Judgement (En 10^{4ff.} 12^{ff.} 18¹¹ 19¹ 21^{7ff.} 67⁷ 90^{21ff.}), or into its burning furnace (54⁶ 98³). Fire is Beliar's fate (Test Jud 25³, Sib 3⁷³), but it is also that of the sinners, like Sodom's (Jub 36¹⁰); it is prepared for the day of the great judgement of God (Test Levi 3²), of which it forms one of the main features (Sib 3⁶⁹⁰). Similarly unquenchable fire (En 67¹³)

is characteristic of Gehenna in Rabbinic opinion (*e.g.* Tos Berak 6f., bab Menachoth 100^a), and from its entrance on earth the smoke arises continually (bab 'Erub 19^a).

Although it is admittedly dangerous to draw inferences from metaphorical language borrowed from local and contemporary usage, yet we may remark that this terrible severity of tone appears to be more consonant with the preaching of the Baptist as reported by Matthew (3^{10. 12}) and Luke (3^{9. 17}), when he makes use of the figures of the bad fruit-tree and of the chaff being "cast into the fire" and "unquenchable fire" respectively as symbolic of the doom of the impenitent.

That our Lord dilated to any extent on the gruesomeness of the destiny of the finally condemned seems to the present writer improbable; for He taught not by portraying terrors, but by proclaiming strong incentives to goodness and service.

(*d*) *Outer Darkness*.—Connected with fire as descriptive of the condition of the ungodly in the underworld is the expression "the outer darkness." This occurs thrice, and in Matthew only.

1. On the first occasion it is contained in a remark addressed by Jesus "to them that followed" after His commendation of the unexpected faith of the centurion at Capernaum: "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall recline with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of the heavens; but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping

and gnashing of teeth" (8^{11f.}). It is generally considered that Q contained the story about the centurion's slave, and possibly this utterance as an after-comment; but Luke renders this hypothesis precarious by the very different position which he gives the verses in his Gospel, and by his rearrangement of them—"There shall be the weeping . . . when ye shall see" the patriarchs "and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without" (13²⁸). It is scarcely adequate to attribute this change in order just to variety of transmission. And Luke has not the reference to outer darkness; although possibly he might have omitted it as an expression less intelligible to his readers. But it is remarkable that he groups the verses, as probably Q did before him, under the general idea of shutting out with those sayings relating to the closed door and the excluded but expectant people who were intimately acquainted with the master who had taught in their streets (13^{24ff.}): very clear evidence that he used the sayings as emphasising the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Gospel and the unconscious self-exclusion of the Jews. Surely he would have felt their appropriateness as a universalist had he found them connected already with the story about the centurion.

2. Again, at the close of that fragment of a parable concerning the Wedding Garment, which has become fused in the Matthean record (22^{11ff.}) with the story of the Crown Prince's Marriage (1^{5. 8ff.}), we have similar words used: "Then the king said to the slaves, Bind

him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness" (18).

Here also the phraseology seems obviously intended to be applied to the result of a condemnatory sentence at the final judgement; which may be a legitimate homiletic interpretation, but has nothing to do with the story itself. Moreover, there is no hint of such a picture of doom in connexion with the Lucan variant or similar narrative of the Great Supper (14^{15ff.}).

3. Lastly, after the conclusion of the parable of the Talents, there is an eschatological addition in Matthew, to which Luke in the related story of the Pounds has no parallel: "and cast ye forth the unprofitable slave into the outer darkness" (25³⁰). Once more the appendage has no original connexion with the mental picture of the parable, but is an easily detachable religious warning.

In the last two instances, and perhaps in all the cases, Church teachers in a Jewish-Christian atmosphere have added for the purpose of individual admonition to the simpler and more authentic version of the stories. It is a noteworthy fact that extreme cold, such as is suggested in the next expression (*e*) below, as well as lambent heat, was supposed to constitute part of the torture of Gehenna; but, despite the light which fire would suggest, the conception of darkness as characteristic of the abode of the wicked (cf. Persian belief, *Yast* 22) frequently found expression in Jewish writings, *e.g.* the evil spirits will enter "into darkness

and chains and a burning fire" (En 103⁸; cf. Tob 14¹⁰); and, unlike the radiant righteous, those born in darkness "will be cast into darkness" (108¹⁴ 63⁶, Ap Ez 7¹²⁵); with fire and frost darkness is combined (Slav En 10²); the sinners inherit darkness (Ps Sol 15¹¹; cf. 14⁶); and into darkness the ungodly are sent back (Sib 4⁴³). So also in the later literature darkness is characteristic of Gehenna (*e.g.* Ber Rabbah 32; Shem R 14; Way R 27; Hag R Josh ben Levi, ap. Wünsche, *op. cit.*, 82).

(e) *Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth*.—On several of these occasions which we have just named above Matthew adds to the outer darkness "the wailing and gnashing of teeth" as characteristic of the state of the outcast evildoers. It is attached in 8¹² 22¹³ and 25³⁰; but it is met with also where the outer darkness is unnamed, yet the state of exclusion is understood.

At the end of the explanation of the parable of the Tares, the phrase is descriptive of the state of those who are pictured as cast into the furnace of fire (13⁴²), and the same also at the close of that of the Net (⁵⁰); but the most obviously inappropriate appending of this eschatological clause is at the conclusion of the contrast between the retributions meted out to the ready and unready slaves respectively.

The untrustworthy one, the story says, the master "shall cut asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites (unfaithful, Lk.); there shall be weeping," etc. (Mt 24⁵¹; cf. Lk 12⁴⁶). These parables drawn from the life of slaves to afford admonition for the

waiting time before the coming of the Kingdom are derived presumably from Q, although they are worked into different contexts; but the phrase in question—albeit appearing once indeed in Luke (13²⁸)—need not be originally from that source, as the rearrangement in this case raises doubts as to the verses.

There is no question of the unflinching sternness of our Lord in warning and denunciation, but it is the inappropriateness of these formally appended expressions as they stand which seems to render their authenticity dubious. They come outside the action of the stories, and have the appearance of interpretative attachments. Moreover, such phrases concerning wailing and lamentation were by no means unfamiliar in the language of apocalypse; *e.g.* according to Slav Enoch, Gehenna is filled with lamentation (40¹²), and even the angels who await their judgement weep (7); while, to name no other instances, “crying and wailing and lamenting” haunt our ears at the end of the Book of Enoch (108^{3ff.}); cf. Midr Koh R (on Koh 4⁵) relative to the impenitent after death.

(f) *The Closed Door*.—Further indications of the adverse judgement when the Kingdom comes with power, typified by the exclusion of the unprepared and unfit, are contained in the similitudes of the closed door which emerge in several places in the Gospel record.

1. The urgent warning to “strive to enter in by the narrow door” (13²⁴) apparently suggested to the

compiler of the sayings or to Luke the attachment of other illustrations of the idea of entrance or exclusion. He passes on to the figure of a master closing the door upon applicants unworthy and insincere, though much professing; with an evident interpretation in the version of the occurrence which we possess as if it had reference to the issue of the ministry of Jesus Himself.

Internal probability seems to be against the originality of the words "thou didst teach in our streets" ⁽²⁶⁾ at any rate; for so public a claim to the prerogative of pronouncing final sentence on men of His time was directly contrary to that policy of undeclared Messiahship which seems to be historically well founded. This leads on to the still more open saying about exclusion from the Kingdom of God of those who assumed their prescriptive right of entrance therein by virtue of religion and of race ^(28f.).

2. Similar doctrine descriptive of doom and loss through the imagery of non-entrance is found in partly parallel sayings, probably from the same source as the above, inserted by Matthew in his Sermon matter after the figures of the narrow (town) "gate" and the narrow "way" ^(7^{18f.}), themselves only another recension of the Lucan similitude in our last paragraph ^(13^{23f.}). According to the first Gospel, the professors of loyalty to Jesus who say "Lord, Lord," will not all find entrance into the Kingdom, but only the doers of the Father's will (cf. p. 52); and then this is associated with another word about saying "Lord, Lord," having

a definitely eschatological import attributed to it by means of the addition "in that day," when the verdict of exclusion will be, in the Psalmist's phrase (68): "depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Mt 7^{21ff.}), as it is in the Lucan form of transmission also (13²⁷). These are they, we remember, who are cast into Gehenna, according to the eschatological explanation of the parable of the Tares (Mt 13⁴¹).

3. Still more obviously we have the same teaching of the necessity for preparedness, whatever the interval of time may be, brought out in the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, in which the doom of exclusion is hinted at by contrast with the glad entrance of those who were ready into the hall of feasting: "and the door was shut" (Mt 25¹⁰). Here again the master, the bridegroom, is represented as "not knowing" the "other virgins"; but the scene is not violently transferred at the close to the stage of divine or Messianic sentence, as in the traditional form of the other parables of exclusion in Matthew, and in that solitary instance in Luke which has been mentioned.

We shall not greatly err if we surmise that Jesus Himself did not thus confuse the stories which He told with secondary application; but the gloomier warning is characteristic of the appeal of the compiler to his compatriots and erstwhile co-religionists.

(g) *Less defined Warnings*.—Lastly, on this darker side of the teaching of Jesus should be included some further suggestions of final rejection and penalty.

1. Such is implied in Mk 14²¹, Mt 26²⁴: "good were it for him"—the "deliverer up" of the Son of man—"if that man had not been born" (for the phrase cf. En 38², Sl En 41², Ap Ez 4¹², Ap Bar 10⁶, bab Ber 17^a). Herein lies a dim presentiment of awful eschatological destiny; but, although it is by no means impossible for Jesus to have uttered this remark at the Last Supper, one can hardly believe that so obvious a speech could have passed unheeded either in the presence of Judas, or even—according to the Johannine narrative (13³⁰)—after his going out.

2. Again, "denial by" or "shame" on the part of the Son of man in relation to those brought for judgement before the Father, carries in itself the implication of an adverse verdict, whether the Son of man be principal witness or actually pronouncer of sentence (Mk 8³⁸, Mt 10³³, Lk 9²⁶; cf. the place and office of Wisdom in co-session with God, Wis 9⁴, En 84⁸ 92¹).

3. Further, associated with the parables of exclusion we discover another hint of eternal loss through absence from the Messianic banquet, which betokened in current realistic imagery the spiritual joy and fellowship of the participants in the Kingdom. Because of the ejaculation of a fellow guest which is reported to have led to its utterance (Lk 14¹⁵), the parable of the Great Supper closes with the words: "For I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper" (24). This is susceptible of an application of eschatological significance; but the primary

intention of the story was simply to reveal the grave danger of indifference to the divine invitation which our Lord had been proclaiming in His ministry.

The setting forth of the available data relative to the state of the condemned suffices by itself to demonstrate the practical purpose which inspired our Lord's eschatological teaching, and testifies that, humanly speaking, He did not enunciate any systematic statement of doctrine on the subject.

CHAPTER VII

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHING AS A WHOLE

A. GENERAL SURVEY

UP to the present we have passed in review and considered the utterances and allusions attributed to our Lord which can be related directly or indirectly to the understanding of His views in regard of the future, as well as such parabolic language as seems to bear testimony to the same. And we have grouped them according to the main subjects of the eschatological teaching of Jesus.

In the course of the inquiry we have been compelled to realise that a considerable reduction has to be made in the data at our disposal which we can deem reliable for our purpose ; seeing that the influences of the habitual preaching and instruction before the compilation of our authorities, and of the individuality of the authors and editors thereof, have to be taken into consideration.

Before we can grasp with any adequacy our Lord's outlook upon the future we must appreciate the incon-

testable fact of that unique Son-consciousness which became the dominant feature of His inner life, regulated His attitude, and was the motive power of His teaching as well as the secret of His marvellous influence upon the minds and bodies of men.

The birth and growth of that confident Sonship we shrank from attempting to fix or describe. Whether any sense of a mission to His people emerged into His normal human consciousness at the time of the episode of the boyhood in the Temple, if that be strictly historical, or was rather — to our psychology — the resultant in the period immediately preceding the Baptism of many impulses of political environment, religious stimulus (John the Baptist) and inward experiences, we may never be able to provide a certain answer with earthly instruments of knowledge; but the fact of the subsequent consciousness of a peculiar relationship to God is central, primary, fundamental. It dominates all.

To it the vocation and the working out of that vocation in terms related to national Messiah or apocalyptic Son of man is really secondary. After the Baptism, at any rate, He knew that God was His Father in an intimate and peculiar sense.

Thus far we may say that the future salvation was to Himself already present; for Him hope was included in harmony. The ideal which He proclaimed for other men was divine sonship indeed, but He was supremely conscious of a unique filial relationship, deep and in-

ward, which—and this is perhaps insufficiently realised—never failed or faltered before temptation or human foe, and probably brought to utterance in the most surely transmitted word from the cross the opening of a psalm which passes through gloom to victory.

While striving to combine a reverent caution with critical independence we have found ourselves gradually urged to the conclusion that in the working out of the calling which He realised so vividly in the privacy of the Baptism experience and the inward struggles which have come to be termed the Temptation our Lord felt Himself to be the agent of warning and of salvation for His fellow-men. And the mode of His opening activity to that end was conditioned by the manner of the ministry of the Baptist, with its insistent urging to repentance and moral reformation in view of the awfulness of divine judgement close at hand.

But from the beginning the constructive religious genius—humanly speaking—of Jesus breaks forth: the positive overcomes the negative, love conquers fear. With Him the glad tidings predominate; the blessedness of the Kingdom is a grander message than the terror of judgement. The supreme aim of our Lord's untiring announcement of the Kingdom's nearness is that all who will should fit themselves as speedily as possible to become its citizens whensoever God manifests it, and that would without doubt be soon. To that end He sends forth His messengers to tell the tidings as well as to prepare the way for His own itinerary; in order

that as many as are responsive to the summons may learn through penitence to practise a righteousness higher than formal orthodoxy, and so abolish the fear of the imminent judgement.

1. First as to the signs of the coming of the Kingdom.

So near was the divine manifestation that Jesus felt the victorious conflict with spirit-powers of evil and the emancipation of their disease-bound captives to be an earnest of it—an effective foregleam of the coming event. On the darker side the family divisions already resulting from His preaching and gathering of adherents betokened the expected birth-pangs of the Messianic age—like the whirling wind-storm that presages the quick oncoming of the long-looked-for boon of heavenly rain. The Lord's disciples, men zealous in prayer and toil, might hasten the imminent manifestation, but assuredly not zealots of the dagger and internecine strife.

Moreover, Jesus was certain that not His judges alone, but the hearers of His gentle words and stern exhortations, the pensioners of His pity, the grateful beneficiaries of His love; the scorner and the prodigal, outcasts redeemed with sympathy and the children of His cherished benedictions, would all alike witness for themselves the inrush unheralded yet universal of the new age, the transmuting of all current religious values, the coming of the Kingdom with power.

2. Next in regard of the subjects of the Kingdom.

Who were to be the subjects of the reign of God according to the expectation of our Lord? The

prophetic warnings of ethical conditions for acceptability seem to have been well-nigh forgotten amid religious narrowness and patriotic fervour. Who could "the sons of the kingdom" be save the true Israelites? Who but the Jews at home and abroad whom God would vindicate against the mighty of the earth when the time for vengeance came? But who are the true Israelites, the elect ones, asks the preaching of Jesus. In His intimate union with the divine will and knowledge of the divine love He becomes assured that the self-confident children with all their ultra-legal punctiliousness will be found unworthy of the glorious citizenship, and that many a one unpractised in the full observances of religion, even despised and excommunicate, but transformed by penitence arising from the acceptance of His warning of the individual sifting which the Kingdom's approaching advent involves, will enter with humble gratitude into the joy of the divine dominion. The Lord knew well in His intuitive Sonship that better was the spirit of the trustful child, the loving willingness of humblest service, the conscious indebtedness of overflowing love, the singleness of devotion to the glorious cause of the Kingdom, the magic of whose message had once thrilled the soul;—better such qualities than all the proud exclusiveness of a self-sufficient legalism and the self-satisfaction of a cold and correct orthodoxy which, conscious of no inward need, rejected and spurned the summons to individual transfiguration through personal repentance. Jesus unhesitatingly asserts that the

individual sinner, social outcast though he may be, stirred by penitence and aflame with responsive love, is inexpressibly dear to that Father-heart of God which His own Son-consciousness knew so well.

But did our Lord contemplate the opening of the citizenship of the reign of God in this special sense to non-Jews? Here the struggle in His human mind is manifest. It was a veritable problem, a new issue which the divine love pervading His human nature compelled Him to face, this breaking down of the barrier of God's favour which kept the chosen people separate from all others.

Race-prejudice, the conditions of the time, the restrictions of His Messianic office, all these imposed the limitation of service, message and grace to His own nation.

And yet the Father's love reflected in the warm heart of the human Son responded to the earnest plea for the demolishing of the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, as an occasional incident such as that of the boon of the Kingdom's anticipatory grace and power bestowed on the foreign woman during the northern exile demonstrates.

And this constitutes the germ of that universalism which was to be slowly apprehended through discussion and conflict by His followers.

Still Jew He was, and Jewish His immediate functions ; and the first if not the sole care of His associates in their missionary ministration was to be the lost sheep of

His own people and the cities of Israel, to the exclusion at the outset at least even of the heretic Samaritan who could however be delineated in story as a pattern of humane love. Yet from the scanty store of reminiscences at our disposal we feel instinctively that a glimpse of a wider future was His, despite the limitations inseparable from the religious outlook of the period, and that the remnant of faithful ones, the elect, the new Israel who should inherit the Kingdom, would consist of more than the dispersed Jews, and would include in God's good time and way more than the prescriptive claimants of the stock of Abraham.

More we cannot say; for although the ethical conditions for membership in the divine dominion were—as they were soon discovered to be—applicable to periods of untold and unthought development just as well as to a brief interval of delay, yet this latter without fear of contradiction was primarily in view, and the time for the dissemination of the tidings was regarded as really very limited, whether this were attributable or not to the prophetic manner from which such fore-shortening seemed inseparable.

Strictly speaking, the Kingdom was not "the end," but its inauguration marked the commencement of the new age, and preparation for its advent was the aim for the urgent individual transformation in the lives of our Lord's compatriots.

In some such way the spiritualising and individualising of eschatological expectations which was becoming

evident in apocalyptic writings, under the influence of Persian religious conceptions on the one hand and of Hellenistic on the other, found a fulness of exercise which issued in universal application later on, when the timelessness of the teaching of Jesus came to be recognised through the Johannine interpretation. Thus the subjects of the coming Rule of God would be the pious who were waiting for redemption and those conscious of sin and need who were also penitent, the Jews (primarily) who responded to the call of a higher righteousness than ceremonial observance.

The religion which fitted for inheritance or reception (according to the standpoint) was one which was co-extensive with life, and one which was characterised by love in activity, manward as well as Godward, and visibly set in human experience in the person of the Master.

3. We must now see what we can gather concerning the office and functions of Jesus in the coming Kingdom.

In the glorious Kingdom of the future what did our Lord conceive His own position to be? Undoubtedly one of rule, leadership and viceroyalty. Although He may have only accepted the title of Messiah from the lips of His intimate disciples at a comparatively late stage of the ministry, and then gave the designation an entirely novel content both as to earthly experience and function; although he only averred His claim publicly (and that by acquiescence rather than by declaration it may be) in the solemn trial scene, yet it would appear

that the Messianic office—albeit variable at different periods both in its interpretation and in its importance—alone afforded Him the national position for service which His Son-consciousness demanded. There was no other figure of national hope with which He could identify Himself; and from the prolonged inward conflict as to what the programme of His saving ministry was to be, our Lord seems to have felt with growing human certitude that He was the Elect One, “he that should come,” champion of the nation in a way more spiritual than had ever been expected.

For reasons which we cannot hope to fathom fully, our Lord appears to have selected the title Son of man to designate Himself; and this afforded Him the possibility of combining in a single term an expression of His confidence in subsequent apocalyptic majesty (Daniel, Sim Enoch) together with the emphasising of the present lowliness of His true humanity (Ezekiel, Psalms); and Jesus seems to have used it in revealing to the astonished disciples that new aspect of Messiahship, which was derived in part at least from the prophecy of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh and from that of the poor and peaceful apocalyptic king incorporated in another prophetic roll (Zechariah).

If we discovered, indeed, that considerable reduction had to be allowed for in the number of authentic occurrences of this expression, and surmised that the originally Marcan series of allusions to impending suffering have been handed down in a manner too stiffly formulated

to be regarded as exactly historical, and too clear to be consistent with the appalling shock of the cross to the disciples, yet we felt that the fact of its use by our Lord was incontestable—and this is of more weight than any tabular statistics of its apparent frequency—and the combination thereby of the ideas of present self-sacrifice and future glory inherently appropriate. It was thus with unwavering confidence that the Lord went on to certain passion and almost certain death, utterly assured that such was the appointed way to His position of acknowledged majesty and Messiahship in that near future which would witness the establishment by God of the dominion which had been the burden of His preaching and the ever-present object of His ministerial work and propaganda.

Crude and materialistic sometimes were the popular conceptions of the Messiah whom the Jews expected; crude and materialistic, we know also, were the views of the primitive Christians concerning the return or second coming of their Messiah who once had trod the earth in humble guise. For the latter transformed the expectation of the heavenly Messiah into that of their Lord's return. The Son of God had come already, the Resurrection appearances and the outpouring of the Spirit had made that assured. In His glorious state in heaven He only awaited the striking of the hour (so to speak) for the eagerly expected coming on the clouds. To the former, the Messiah—whatever else he might prove—would surely be national redeemer,

vanquisher of foes and bringer of freedom, upbuilder of a Jerusalem enjoying material luxury, and after a war of vengeance on their oppressors, king of peace.

It would be easy to dilate upon the nature of the Messiah of Jewish popular longing or of the intent watching of the early Christians; but what our Lord expected for Himself in His own Messianic consciousness is what we desire to know, and just this is so difficult to infer, and yet so easily assumed on the one hand and a problem frequently neglected on the other.

The assurance of dominion on God's behalf was certainly His. He felt Himself to be the ruler of the elect and righteous who would constitute the members of the Kingdom,⁸ and possibly He conceived that His closest followers would share the authority over the people in a manner that could be symbolised by earthly forms of administrative dignity. He became, moreover, supremely convinced that the way to Messianic dominion was through rejection and finally death; such the Temptation experiences together with the predictions of suffering—alike to be accepted as fundamentally historical—certainly testify.

Our Lord's unquestioning faith in the power of the divine Father whose love He was revealing to men, as well as an undoubted participation in the comparatively recent conviction of individual resuscitation which was already held firmly by the majority of the people, rendered a special divine act of resurrection, the mode

by which He believed that He would pass to the assumption of the glorious prerogatives of the Son of man from heaven in God's own time ; thus fusing in mental vision the distinct conception of manifestation from above with that of being raised from the earth. The popular traditional apocalyptic interval of three days Jesus probably named as symbolic of the briefest delay. His speedy manifestation from heaven, conceived of in terms of space, would be virtually coincident with the establishment of the Kingdom.

4. But some aspects connected with the Son of man designation require further consideration. That title was linked indeed in conception with the idealised personification of the Israel which was to compose the dominion of the saints of God (Daniel), and had become, according to one section of apocalyptic speculation (*Similitudes of Enoch*), used for the heavenly being who was identified with the Messiah, the Elect One, and accredited with prerogatives of national judgement, while equipped also with ethical qualities for his sway.

Still we found it to be a remarkable fact that just the judicial functions (as commonly understood) were practically unmentioned by our Lord in relation to Himself except according to the most Jewish and at the same time the most ecclesiastical of the records of His teaching.

With this silence the composite and unhomogeneous collection of discourses and sayings—already associated with some episodes in what is usually called Q—which

is probably the oldest connected written stratum, is in agreement, seeing that it implies no claim greater than that of being, in the capacity of the divine Son and the human Companion, the bearer of the decisive testimony before the Father-Judge as to the individual attitude of men to Himself as the bringer of the message of the coming Kingdom which they had heard.

Here again national and local limitations which cannot well be late or secondary are manifest. Of any expression of our Lord's views as to His own prerogatives and functions after the judgement which sifts—at the least—Israel that has heard for those worthy of citizenship under the conditions of the new age we are told nothing. We may therefore suppose that He did not teach anything contradictory to the current conception at its best of an eventually peaceful and prosperous rule—of whatever duration—over a clean-hearted and contented people.

The fact that Jesus used, even at the solemn moment of the farewell meal, figures capable of gross and material interpretation concerning the Messianic feast, implying the eating of celestial food—whether popularly regarded then as the flesh of mythological monsters, or, as later, of heaven-sent manna—and the gladness of wine in the Kingdom of God need not trouble us. For our Lord's clear doctrine on the resurrection question uttered in response to the priestly objectors intimated that He went behind the sensuous imagery of popular realism to the spiritual and eternal values; to the bliss of the

presence of God and of the saints of old, and to the joy of constant communion. In like manner the glad duties of the godly in the risen life were not to be conceived of in terms of normal earthly existence, but as perfect willing service in which physical relationships would be transfigured, hallowed and purified by mutual devotion to the Father and King. Thus our Lord used these and other contemporary symbols because they were to hand and current ; but in using He moralised and spiritualised them, directing attention to the deep truths which they were capable of expressing, although common belief probably took such apocalyptic pictorial presentations quite literally then, as the uncultured do still. But to this feature we shall have to revert subsequently.

Reflexions such as these suffice to show us how scanty seem to have been the allusions even in our Lord's intimate teaching on what we may call His own eschatological functions. The present work, the present duty as the Herald of that new age in which He would be uplifted by the Father, absorbed His human energies ; the secret for Himself and the disposition which He sought to arouse in His associates was filial trust, unflinching and complete. His task and theirs it was to proclaim and transform men's hearts, but to give the Kingdom belonged to the Father's grace.

The environment of the teaching was national, its atmosphere, so to speak, was apocalyptic, the time and place conditions compelled that ; but in the transmuting through the spirit of Jesus that which was eschatological

became intrinsically ethical, as we shall see again in a later section. In any case the expression of the apocalyptic hope of a people, of a religious community, and of an individual, always implies the application of moral and spiritual standards; because it reflects their sense of what is deserving of blessedness or woe when the inequalities and injustices of life on earth will, as it is hoped, be abolished; it is a mirror of ethical estimate.

But in the utterances of our Lord, in doctrine both direct and indirect, in aphorism and illustrative story alike, the conditions of communion with God or man in the glorious society of to-morrow were made exclusively dependent on the individual relationships—spiritual, ethical and social—of to-day, while to-day may last. That is the point. Accurate orthodoxy, punctilious observance of service, sacrifice or fast, even membership of a religiously privileged race, became once and for all secondary.

Herein lay the divine authority of the Master's transforming of religious values, as opponents realised, although they rejected His claim, even to a greater extent than in the more public acts of inherent and conscious power—the declaration of forgiveness, the warning of the replacing of the material Temple by spiritual and non-local worship, or the abrogating of traditions gradually framed to guard the Sabbath's sanctity. Herein too was the nucleus of a practical religion for humanity at large.

5. The words of our Lord which concern the subject

of the Resurrection require some further general comment.

The fact of resurrection is nowhere argued by Jesus ; it is taken for granted. But for the question of the Sadducees which afforded the occasion for the only statement which has been preserved in the records about the nature of the life of the raised saints we should have had no direct teaching from our Lord's lips. And we saw in discussing the references that the only resurrection worthy of the name was that of the righteous, because it alone was regarded as an act anticipatory to life in the Kingdom of God. It is to be inferred that the raising (if any) of the ungodly would be for the purpose of the final divine judgement which would issue in their doom.

Upon the time of the Resurrection no information is vouchsafed, but it is evidently in our Lord's perspective virtually coincident with the establishment of the Kingdom. There is nothing to justify us in holding that Jesus certainly shared the view of a preliminary raising of Jewish patriarchs and heroes, or that a wider resurrection was to be expected at a later stage, as the believers in a temporary Messianic dominion taught. Nor had He apparently occasion to allude to the rising again of any who were not Israelites, unless Mt 8¹¹ || is to be thus interpreted. This reserve of Jesus, or at any rate the silence of our documents in matters on which many speculations were rife, compels us to feel that with allusions so scanty an attitude of reverent agnosticism is imperative.

Speaking, however, with all diffidence, the reason for the fewness of the recorded words appears to be that a doctrine on the scope of the Resurrection lay outside the intense practical purpose of our Lord's preaching, directed as it was to His own contemporaries.

For them at least in the mass resurrection was not at all in question. The Kingdom of God would be manifested in their lifetime. Such evidence as we possess seems to imply, as we have admitted already, that the true resurrection was to life in the Kingdom, and was only predicated of the just. Continued or restored consciousness for the purpose of judgement would appear to be presupposed, but that is not termed by our Lord resurrection, and in His days the resuscitation for it even of all dead Jews was by no means universally assumed. The only reputed words from which we could justifiably conclude that all men would be raised, godly and ungodly, Jew and Gentile alike, are in the peculiar Lucan addition (20^{38b}) and the Matthean detail of the assembling of "all the nations" (25³²); but of these touches the authenticity and the exact interpretation are so uncertain that it would be unwise to rest a doctrine of the universal raising of the dead thereupon. We have to remember that we are confining ourselves to the reasonably assured teaching of Jesus, not dealing with that of the New Testament as a whole, nor with the moral demands of humanity.

That the act and time of resurrection are in the Father's hands alone is our Lord's assumption through-

out, and no sayings are preserved concerning any order in resuscitation, but the divine act is regarded as one and coincident with the initiating of the Kingdom and preparatory to the Judgement connected therewith.

From the fragmentary and occasional references of Jesus by themselves we are bound to admit that it is not possible to construct a satisfactory, systematic or consistent doctrine of resurrection. We must, however, remember also that the transformed yet semi-physical state of existence on a renovated earth, which was expected by the Jews at that period, is even more foreign to our modes of thought than the Pauline conception of the "spiritual body," which is not devoid of material elements.

But the quasi-physical rising from the dead which is to the blessedness of the Kingdom leads us to attempt to form some estimate also of the implications of the meagre material concerning the scope, grounds and issues of the Judgement.

6. When we endeavour to summarise the teaching of our Lord on the subject of the Judgement we cannot fail to be impressed once more by His remarkable reticence; especially if we have regard to the manifold opinions which seem to have been current concerning its place in the eschatological scheme and the diverse views which were entertained as to its scope. But it is really sufficient for us that the fact is postulated by Jesus throughout; as also its individual character and its dependence on the conduct of this life.

With regard to the time of the divine judgement, the most obvious and most justifiable inference from the fragmentary teaching is that it would come, as the Baptist had led men to expect, at the inauguration of the Kingdom, which was looked for before the generation of our Lord's contemporaries had passed away—possibly, but not necessarily, after the dead had been gathered to receive their sentence; when His rejecters, themselves rejected, should see the bliss of patriarchs and faithful; and His judges, self-condemned, should see Him in the position of divine viceroyalty. If this were accounted on the one hand “the last day” or “the consummation of the age,” it marked equally on the other the initiation of the new era.

In connexion with the person of the Judge enough has been said before (pp. 124, 154) to show that the decisive part which our Lord seems to have conceived to be His own was that of witness to the fidelity of His adherents and of the recipients of His message; and consequently accuser of the rejecters among His own generation. But as to any function connected with the dead or with non-Jewish peoples we hear nothing, except in the closing parable of the first Gospel, on the details of whose scenic setting we should do well not to lay too much stress. Here only are gathered for the Son of man's forensic judgement “all the nations,” whatever be the scope of that expression, if it be authentic. Nowhere else does our Lord's prerogative to pronounce sentence emerge, save in the interpretative expansion of

one parable (Lk 13^{26f.}), and in the allegorical explanation of another (Mt 13⁴¹), and in both cases we seem to have extended inferences contained in secondary material. While the opinions held among the Jews which attributed strictly judicial functions to the Most High and also to the Messiah were not of necessity mutually exclusive, yet the prevailing if not sole authentic doctrine of our Lord was that the Father alone is Judge.

As to the range of the Judgement, if we restrict ourselves to the teaching of Jesus, we cannot say that any certain definition is supplied. Because of the subsequent universalistic interpretation of the Matthean dramatic scene as descriptive of a final assize, we are apt to assume a horizon more extensive than that of contemporary thought.

It is doubtful if "all the nations" meant to the compiler an assembly of every race and people of the world for a forensic verdict, as is generally supposed, even accepting the picture of the application of one principle of judgement as coming in the main from the Master.

The woes on the cities imply at the least that the divine sentence will affect the populations of countries which have had dealings with the holy nation in the past, and that according to their opportunities. But in these cases the whole emphasis lies on the warning therefrom for our Lord's own people and own generation with its peculiar advantages, and therefore on it would fall the severity of condemnation for the rejecting of the divine summons proclaimed by Himself and His disciples.

Inferences on the universal side soon came to be drawn in the missionary expansion of the Church, but from our Lord's own words we have no clear definition of the subjects of the Judgement.

Yet here again we are enabled to account for the fact by the present and practical aim of the preaching of Jesus: that His hearers and compatriots should through penitence and the transformed life of sonship be partakers in the coming Kingdom and thereby escape adverse sentence from the divine Judge.

Our Lord had no new teaching to give on what constituted the basis of judgement, but He threw new light on the meaning of life's conduct for His contemporaries. He declared that one principle of testing would be the individual relation of men to Himself as the Proclaimer of the Kingdom, a loyal adherence assuring them of a place therein, for such he would openly "confess" in the Judgement.

This constituted what we may term the filial side of religious conduct.

But another principle of testing would be the manifestation of love in activity as portrayed in the descriptive scene of separation.

This exhibited the fraternal side of the religious life.

Yet from various points of view, as we have seen (p. 82 ff.), there were ethical conditions essential to membership in the imminent Kingdom, the lack of which constituted inevitably grounds for the adverse verdict of exclusion therefrom.

That words as such form a basis of judgement (Mt 12^{36f.}) we cannot but regard as doubtfully authentic teaching. Although the grading of punishable expressions was not unknown, and later Jewish literature has parallels concerning the evil fate of the maligner of a co-religionist, it appears best to regard this unique passage as rather an extended application concerning the "evil things" from the human heart.

The idea of separation (and consequent gathering), either for the joy of the righteous or for the doom of the ungodly, is not only contained in the similitude of the Sheep and the Goats and in the subsequent picture of the dividing of the loving from the indifferent, and in a primitive apocalyptic passage like that concerning the sudden taking of one companion and the rejecting of the other, but it is inherent also in the parables of mixture, although the eschatological interpretations which are supplied by the first Gospel do not commend themselves as being authentic fragments of the Lord's teaching. Exclusion and consequently separation we found to be implied again and again in figure, but we are once more confronted with that remarkable reserve in the utterances of Jesus, as He refrains from affording anything that can be called a description of the respective destinies of those accepted for and excluded from the Kingdom. And the supreme solemnity of present decision for His hearers only gained emphasis thereby. The gloom of the fate of the possibly excluded is but deepened by our Lord's yearning that men

should enjoy the bliss of the subjects of the reign of God.

Of the ultimate issues for the wicked and the unreceptive, when due regard has been given to the metaphorical references to places and conditions of the condemned, we venture to submit humbly that no certain doctrine can be deduced from the recorded words of our Lord.

If He implied that for the excluded there was no existence worthy of the name, we had rather acknowledge that the matter remains a mystery still, than attribute to Him teaching which emerged later.

Indeed, mindful of the divergent views which were then held, and recalling the Jewish up-bringing of the incarnate Lord, we are inclined to feel that the final issue which was in prospect for the ungodly—after due cognisance of doom and acknowledgment of the justice of the divine exclusion—was adumbrated in expressions like perishing, destruction, loss of life, fire, Gehenna. Terrible as is the loss depicted by such terms, no authentic utterance of Jesus appears certainly to presuppose for the condemned unending suffering or even unending persistence. The expressions seem to have stood for a fate which—whether rapid or not as we measure time—we should designate annihilation or extinction. But the data are inadequate for a solution of the question: perhaps intentionally so; perhaps rather because of the expected immediateness of the answer to all men's speculations on the subject in the near advent of the Kingdom itself.

Nor is there anything recorded from our Lord's lips to support the doctrine of the restoration and final salvation of evil men.

For all the earthly probation is deemed sufficient, as far as is revealed. And that appears to harmonise best with the complete acquiescence and trust of Jesus in the perfect love and justice of God; the heavenly Father knows all the conditions for each individual human child. If the light upon the issues of the Judgement is to us disappointingly dim, we can nevertheless repose in our Lord's confidence; for to Him the ultimate and rapid triumph of goodness was assured, and in the Kingdom of God nothing but good would remain.

7. This leads us to refer to the indications as to the issue for Evil in the time to come. The reality of the existence of evil to our Lord's human mind is undeniable. In the present stage of New Testament investigation it would be hazardous not to admit frankly that all the evidence tends to show that Jesus was in every way save in His peculiar Son-consciousness—that unique and unparalleled harmony with the divine will and revelation of the Father's love which illuminated His own experience—the child of His age: a Jew, a Galilean indeed in national prejudice and up-bringing, inheritor of racial convictions, and affected by the syncretistic results and tendencies of His people's dependent position and universal dissemination. Consciously or unconsciously the dualism appropriated and assimilated from Persian intercourse, as well as the individualistic outlook

traceable to the same source and fostered by contact with Hellenistic thought, must have been factors in our Lord's religious heritage. It would have been anomalous then if He had not shared the already firmly rooted belief in the existence of a dominion of evil, a hierarchy of spirit-powers ranged against the Most High, working upon and in men for ill, even if He did not actually (as is assumed in the Fourth Gospel) accept the current opinion that the Adversary was prince of this world and held it in his evil sway in continuous conflict against the angel emissaries of the Creator's far-distant majesty. But it was just at this weak spot in the prevailing conception, due no doubt to the anxiety to conserve the divine transcendence, that our Lord's Sonship-experience overcame the dualism. The Holy One was *not* absent, but a Father ever near, and the longing of Jesus was for His brethren to share to the utmost of their capacity the filial consciousness which He possessed.

His powers, the proleptic potencies of the coming Kingdom, were even then available for others according to the adequacy and constancy of the faith of the individual disciple. In his own supreme confidence He was stronger than the strong, victorious over the manifestations of the kingdom of evil. Those whom He and His contemporaries deemed possessed were subject to the Master's healing and transforming influence, to the sway of His personality. The domain of evil was rending asunder; in prophetic certainty He had beheld Satan, its ruler, falling. Of the triumphant issue of the

struggle between the dominions of light and of darkness, of good and of evil, there was not any doubt; for signs of the impending victory were already present in His own work.

As to what would be the fate of the prince of darkness, his ministers and his vassals, it appears likely that our Lord did not discourse, for it was beyond the horizon of the transforming purpose of His teaching. Nor did He ever speak of Himself, as far as we can perceive, in the capacity of the final conqueror of Satan or of the destroyer of evil spirits. He may have given a relative assent to the popular expectation of the binding, burning, and finally destroying of the devil and his angels, as is suggested in the reported cry of the demoniacs and intimated in the dramatic judgement-scene; but here again we must beware of building definite doctrine upon a highly realistic and descriptive allusion, even if the transmission be reliable and the tradition authentic.

8. There is one event which looms darkly in the still nearer future to our Lord, the fate of Jerusalem. There seems to be little doubt that He foresaw the doom of the Holy City, and consequently the destruction of the Temple. The detailed imagery, however, relating to the former on the occasion of His weeping on Palm Sunday, and of the discourse suggested by the latter upon the Mount of Olives, may be rightly regarded as of subsequent colouring. Yet even these terrible events were most likely deemed by Jesus to be immediately

anticipatory to the establishment of the Kingdom; unexpected enough to the Jews in themselves, but a part of the final catastrophe, veritable throes preceding the birth of the new age.

It is hardly to be denied that the conventional apocalyptic stages which have the same sequence in the threefold record of the complex discourse just mentioned about the things before the end are most probably Jewish material appropriated and adapted very early by Christians, having genuine dominical sayings embedded therein and associated therewith, sayings such as we meet with in Q in less precisely-defined eschatological contexts.

Indeed, it would appear most consonant with the method of the Master, even when conversing with His intimate disciples, to suppose that He did not describe or detail the events which would precede the end (or His coming, Mt.), but in lieu of any such esoteric instruction directed their minds to the lessons which the habit of the fig-tree at summer's approach taught them, and emphasised in manifold ways the supreme urgency of personal watchfulness and preparedness.

Even then the Lord's warnings are not in our popular and limited sense of the term eschatological—relating to the end of the world.

We have nothing to tell us that Jesus spoke of anything beyond the Kingdom in public or in private, and it may safely be assumed that He regarded the reign of God as final and everlasting. Only relatively does He

seem to have regarded the Kingdom as Messianic, as strictly speaking His own: it is the rule of the heavens, of God, almost solely in His utterances. He had no occasion—as far as our reports go—to express an opinion or take a side on the subject of the duration of Messiah's reign, which, although eternal to some apocalyptic writers (Sim Enoch), was generally viewed as temporary by Jewish (Pss Sol, Jub, Ap Ezra, Sib) and in part by Jewish-Christian (Paul, Apoc) thought. We should not indeed be far wrong in saying that to the mind of our Lord the Kingdom is itself identical with the new age, and fills completely the horizon of the unreckoned and undefined future, and the end as such is left with God.

9. Before we close our summary—which from the nature of the data can but be tentative and inferential—of these indications of our Lord's outlook we must call attention to the stress on positive principles which characterises His eschatological teaching.

Stern as His denunciations were against hypocrisy and sham, even as practised by some in the highest religious quarters—allowing for all the necessary discounting of the Matthean presentation, it is remarkable that the greater part of our Lord's words, whether hortatory or parabolic, which refer to the Kingdom and existence beyond death are related to the brighter side: the happiness of the loving and the lowly, the pious and the penitent; the pure joy of incorporation in the society of the elect, the righteous and forgiven, the cleansed and vindicated.

Never does Jesus teach by the direct appeal to terror; only for His own followers does He proclaim the rightful awe of Him who finally judges unfaithfulness. In the religious education of His hearers our Lord in His divine-human sympathy makes the Father's love the prime motive of change of heart; He points and leads men to the ideal, the desirable, the highest blessedness of intercourse with God and the loving communion of redeemed penitents.

Only in the bitterness of disillusionment and sorrow at the indifference and contemptuous rejection on the part of various strata of the population does Jesus depict in negative terms the awful doom of the despisers, be they cities or classes or individuals, as a revelation of unmeasured loss and unreckoned misery to come: the shame of the Judgement, the absence of Life, the terrible exclusion from the joy of the presence of God and of His faithful ones.

The value for us moderns of this notable feature of the doctrine of our Lord will be considered in the concluding chapter.

B. TRACES IN THE PRIMITIVE PREACHING, ETC.

Although the sole authorities for our investigation are to be found in the writings of the evangelists concerning the Lord's life and work, it is only natural at first sight that we should expect that what was new and transforming in the outlook of Jesus upon the future would produce some echo or reflexion in the

utterances or ideas of the apostolic leaders of the infant Palestinian community, which, by reason of the conviction brought about by the appearances of the risen Lord, looked upon Him as indubitably the Anointed, at present exalted in the heavens and soon to come to earth in majesty to inaugurate the Kingdom.

But when we study the accounts (incorporated in the Acts) which have come down to us from those early days and read between the lines, while we have to make due discount for the spread of wondrous stories, for the inevitable growth of legendary accretions, and for the difficulties of an editor collecting his materials often at second or third hand, we become aware of so great an immediate transformation in the central subject-matter of the message that we cease to be surprised that eschatological elements which were prominent in our Lord's doctrine fall away relatively into the background of the primitive proclaimers' thoughts and words.

For the original Apostles themselves the Gospel which had constituted the message of Jesus (whether He termed it so or not) became the Gospel about Him (cf. Mk 1¹). From the beginning, under the influence of the appearances of the Lord and the experiences of Pentecost, they preached "Jesus and the resurrection" rather than the coming Kingdom (4². 33). The public avowal of Jesus (who had lived and died amongst them) as the present and actual Messiah by virtue of the divine act of resurrection changed the whole perspective for the disciples and so transformed their teaching.

The nearness of the Kingdom of God which had been the burden of their Master's cry and theirs during His humble earthly ministry gave place to the preaching and baptizing "in the name of Jesus Christ" (2³⁸), the proclamation of Him as "both Lord and Christ" (3⁶).

Belief in His name and person, and consequent change of heart and life, together with attachment to the constantly increasing band of His followers, became the natural substitute for the repentance and adherence of pre-crucifixion days in view of the imminent approach of the Kingdom (2³⁸ 3^{16.19}). The thought-world both of preachers and listeners thus became inevitably reorientated. The immediate past filled the mind, because therein was to be discovered the key to the future. The stumbling-block of the cross, which was blasphemy to Saul and the orthodox Jews, was very truth; for the Crucified was exalted to kingly power and would bring the Kingdom (2^{25. 34} 4²⁷ 5³¹). Individual faith in the Person, the transfiguring impress of whose life and influence was beginning to be more and more fully felt, was now the way of access to the glorious Kingdom that would come with judgement, and such faith was the concomitant of personal repentance.

From the very first, then, a gradual change of outlook was silently at work, the community of the faithful (soon to be known as "Christians") began to regard themselves inevitably as the nucleus of the holy people, the true Israel, the elect shortly to be vindicated, and the assemblies of the disciples of Jesus came to form

the Kingdom in becoming even here on earth. Thus it was that in the earliest preaching—as exhibited with fundamental truth despite their popular character and editorial handling in the opening chapters of Luke's second volume—the present glorious office of the risen Jesus as the Messiah is the central fact, and the Kingdom and the Judgement associated therewith fall quite accountably into a less prominent position.

The excitement as to the immediate establishment of a nationally conceived dominion (1⁶) was absorbed and redirected in the eager summoning of compatriots to share in the blessed assurance of entrance by faith and baptism while there was yet time. The present, indeed, included future salvation, but, as in the Master's exhortations, the present action and reaction was primary (2^{21. 40} 4¹²).

The certainty of His coming derived from and confirmed by the farewell vision of the risen Lord (1¹¹) must have stimulated the warning note in the preaching to the disciples' co-religionists; for the spiritual phenomena were the outcome of His heavenly glorification (2³³), and the "times of restoration" would coincide with the "sending" to earth of that same Person as the Messiah" (3^{20f.}); while repentance and remission of sins were attainable in the interval through personal faith in Him (5³¹). Here we seem to have reflected the predictions of majesty and the claim on personal allegiance through discipleship.

Only once—in the Petrine address at the house of

Cornelius—is any reference reported to the judgeship of Jesus, and that is in terms singularly like the statement attributed to St. Paul at Athens (10⁴²; cf. 17³¹).

Thus completely has belief in the Servant who had suffered (3¹³. 18. 26), the risen Jesus, as actually being the Christ of long expectation, become the dominating factor in the apostolic proclamation, and through it entrance to the Kingdom or “repentance unto life” is alone to be obtained by Jew or, as realised later, by Gentile (11¹⁸). In this way the process is seen to be commencing by which the nationalistic eschatology—through the pressure of events (the Pauline conflict concerning Gentile membership) as well as the disintegrating influence of Hellenistic thought—would pass into one that was individual and universal.

But as at first in the doctrine of Jesus, so later through spiritual intercourse with the risen Lord, it was ethically conditioned.

Although no definite expression thereof has been recorded, we feel instinctively that the direct appeal of such apostolic teaching as has been outlined must have had for its reverse and negative side, as in our Lord’s admonitions, the warning against that perishing, rejection and exclusion from the blessedness of the new and true Israel, which would mark the fate of the scorner, the indifferent and the unreceptive (2⁴⁰ 3²³).

It may, however, be asked: Have we no direct clue to the teaching of the Master mediated through the

consciousness of the Apostles and others, by means of their writings emanating from the period after they were transformed by the experiences of the Resurrection and of Pentecost? The difficulty of giving an affirmative answer to this question arises from the fact that careful criticism has raised very grave doubts as to the authenticity of the "general epistles" of Peter or John, James or Jude.

The strongest plea may be made for *1 Peter*, on the supposition that it was composed very late in his life, so as to be able to account for the atmosphere of persecution and its obvious Paulinism, and that the actual writer was a Greek (? Silvanus), who utilised the LXX version for the frequent quotations. Here indeed the object of Christian hope and the aim of Christian preparedness through orderliness and well-doing is "the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1⁷. 13; cf. 5) at the end of the last times, which are already being experienced (1⁵. 20 4⁷). This, it may be argued, is not far from the synoptic standpoint of the predictions of the manifestation of the Son of man. Moreover, to the risen Lord all powers are subjected, and to Him as Judge of the living and the dead (according to one interpretation) account will be rendered of life's conduct (3²² 4⁵). From condemnation the faithful are exempt, and joy will be their portion "at the revelation of his glory"; but "the ungodly and sinner" where shall they appear? (4¹³. 18). Over their eternal loss a veil is drawn.

Again, the interest of the mystic interpreter and

possibly preserver of reminiscences of our Lord's discourses is, as his epistle (*1 John*) testifies, in the knowledge and life which are present experiences; but although it is once said to be "the last hour" (2¹⁸), it is the past and not the future that stirs him to strong and earnest teaching in order to counteract the dangerous influence of the docetic Gnostics who had come to question the real humanity of Jesus.

We pass to the writings traditionally ascribed to the brethren of our Lord. The epistle of *James* does not claim to have been penned by the brother of Jesus, and the Jewish culture which pervades it is strongly Hellenistic, rather than that of a Galilean peasant who became later the leader of the Jerusalem community.

Here, moreover, the delay of the Lord's "parousia" has been evidently long; religious and social disorders have crept in, hopes are waning, and patience needs weighty encouragement (5⁷); while the Judge who stands before the doors may well signify the returning Christ (9).

But the enthusiasm and motive power of the first age seem to have passed away, and the dangers characteristic of a rapidly spreading Church are supplying fresh problems to be solved.

The writing which opens with the name of *Judas* presupposes the identification of the author's brother with James the brother of the Lord, and looks to the imminent coming of "Jesus Christ," for whom

the elect are being "kept" ⁽¹⁾, and to His "mercy," possibly as Judge ⁽²⁾.

But "the faith" signifies already truths believed, a body of "sound doctrine" which ungodly men are undermining ^(3ff.), who are the objects of terrible threatenings in apocalyptic terms (Enoch, Asc Moses).

The personal apostolic teaching was also a thing long past, and the period of composition is regarded as "the last time" ^(17f.).

We conclude, then, that in these letters we possess no certain data from which we can add to our knowledge of the eschatological outlook of our Lord Himself.

It was not so much in the fervent and full toil of the first generation, but when the Apostles had passed away and the living voice of witnesses of the episodes of the last week and of the revelation of the risen Master was still, at a time when men were eager to have preserved for them in writing the precious traditions of the Saviour's life and teaching as a norm for instruction and a defence against heresy, that Christians busied themselves afresh with growing feverishness about the return of the Lord, the Judgment, and the consummation of the age which was associated with these events. Then wavering faith began to give place to fear because of the prolonged delay; until the Greek modes of thought which a rapidly developing Gentile Christianity had contributed enabled the saints of the Johannine type to

realise and to demonstrate that their religion, if it was to be universal, could flourish and persist better without that local and national eschatology which had been indeed primary in time, but was not essential to the life of faith.

Yet Church teachers were far from criticising the time-honoured expectations inherited from the mother-church of Jerusalem and from the Lord's own words as reported in the Gospel traditions—especially in the Matthean form, which was the most popular, and the people were loth to relinquish those fragments of the old belief and half-formulated Gentile hopes, which the present joy of a life “hid with Christ,” and a present sharing in a divine society on earth in reality contradicted; so that they were content to preserve side by side without any consciousness of inconsistency—as believers do still—elements from different races, religions and civilisations which were strictly irreconcilable, in the course of the age-long and ever-active syncretism of a world-embracing Christianity.

The rending heavens once looked for yet remain a symbol of eternal hope in God's Son, Jesus Christ. Religion proves to be wider and deeper than the logical analysis of its forms of expression, and the old literalism has to give place to a larger symbolism.

It remains for us now to set forth as concisely as possible that reinterpretation of such profound and as yet not fully appreciated significance and value which the “spiritual Gospel” affords, before we attempt in

conclusion to estimate the importance for the modern man, with his world-view so vastly transcending the Jewish-Christian one, of that extension of the religious horizon and departure from the primitive outlook which was initiated by St. Paul, developed by the author of the Fourth Gospel, and has continued silently and unconsciously during the militant progress of the catholic Church.

CHAPTER VIII

THE JOHANNINE INTERPRETATION

I. WHEN we approach the Gospel "according to John" in order to see whether the main ideas of the outlook of Jesus as presented therein are identical with those which the reports of the Synoptists exhibit to us or otherwise, we find that it would be but slight exaggeration to say that the idea of the Kingdom of God—the very theme of the whole ministry in the earlier records—is practically absent.

The larger conception of Life has taken its place. The catastrophic and still in some measure materially represented future has been replaced by an inward, mystic, and spiritually conceived present, which is yet eternal; John is the heir of Paul and the developer of his teaching. That which is implicit in the latter, or only occasionally explicit, finds in the former lofty and permanent expression, suffused with a grand humanity which brushes aside for ever Jewish limitations, and affords a world-wide heritage for all who are capable of the like deep and spiritual experience.

Said Paul: "the kingdom of God is . . . righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Ro 14¹⁷); said

Jesus, according to the belief of the later Egyptian disciple, and perhaps of Luke: "the kingdom of God is within you" (Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrh. Papp.*, iv. 6; cf. Lk 17²¹). Much more to this mystic interpreter, who had offered to his Lord all that the various streams of religious thought in his time brought to his feet, the Kingdom of God was the sphere of inward spiritual experience, with which neither persecution nor death could interfere. Entered indeed in time by way of spiritual birth, it was yet an indwelling of God in the soul ever present and ever abiding.

This author, after looking on upon the national upheaval culminating in A.D. 70, realises that the material reign of Jewish Messianic hope will never come to pass, and feels that he truly represents the inmost spirit of his Master's teaching, when in his Gospel the outward vision of triumphant dominion is transformed into the inward vision of divine indwelling and communion consequent on sacramental and spiritual re-birth.

Thus in the Nicodemus episode Jesus says with the utmost solemnity: "Except a man be born from above (or anew, *ἀνωθεν*), he cannot see (*ἰδεῖν*, apprehend) the kingdom of God." Moreover, that new birth has its outward token before men and its inward potency of change: "Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (3^{3.5}). Whether the reference to water be original or not, the teaching of the whole context is obviously that the new birth belongs to the spiritual sphere, and the perception

of the Kingdom and entrance therein signify the conscious beginning of an inward and permanent experience of the nature of that mystic union which is prominent in the Johannine writings, and emerges also in the close and reposeful harmony with God through the Son which the so-called Odes of Solomon manifest (*e.g.* 3, 8, 10, 12, 17, 28).

Not again does this the most familiar term of the preaching of Jesus occur, but we are reminded that His lordship is entirely supra-sensible, when He declares before the Roman governor with repeated emphasis: "The kingdom that is mine is not of (~~ἐκ~~) this world . . . not from hence" (18³⁶); a tacit correction or at least a spiritualising of conceptions which had been suggested by the use of popular imagery in the teaching of the Master (*e.g.* Mt 19²⁸, Ac 1⁶), and had indeed proved of vast value and propulsive power for the primitive community.

In this book, under the stress of world-events and after meditation on the reinterpretation and readjustment which such a change in circumstances demanded, we have the term "the kingdom of God," as used by the Jews of an objective solely future and adopted by our Lord—although He transformed its content and emphasised the conditional nature of its citizenship—entirely rejected as inadequate and misleading in comparison with the comprehensive word current in the language of mystic religious philosophy, Life. And the passage thereto was facilitated by the Jewish con-

ception of life in the coming age, in the new world, which men might see. Moreover, this very term we have already (p. 222) found interchangeable with the Kingdom in the synoptic writings. The life which is life indeed, begun consciously now, appropriated in the present, yet inherently eternal in quality, absorbed all that the Kingdom meant in its most spiritual interpretation; but the word avoided all that was earthly, temporal, material and limited in the older expression.

2. When we examine the passages in the Fourth Gospel in which the title Son of man is named in our Lord's utterances we find an entire change, a transforming readjustment of the use of terms, just as in relation to that of the Kingdom of God. Only in this case the expression appears more frequently. Nevertheless the reorientation is complete. The Son of man, as the Jewish figure of the future, virtually vanishes. The title becomes a synonym for the eternal Logos of the prologue in His incarnate state, the Enochic conception of the Son of man as pre-existent but hidden with the Lord of spirits till His manifestation having formed perhaps a link of connexion. In order to realise the difference from the phenomena presented by the synoptic tradition, let us review the occurrences rapidly.

In the reflective dialogue which follows the teaching addressed to Nicodemus upon the necessity of spiritual re-birth our Lord is represented as emphasising the difficulty of believing "heavenly things," and then He

announces something which seems akin to a passion programme: "And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, the Son of man. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him may have eternal life" (3^{13ff.}) Even supposing the clause "who is in heaven" not to be original—and we may be permitted to doubt whether the case against it has not been overstated—the standpoint is clearly one subsequent to the close of the "truly" incarnate life of the Logos, and the exaltation is that of the resurrection and ascension, and most probably has nothing to do with suffering as such, but rather expresses the return to previous glory. On the other hand, in a later connexion the lifting up is ascribed to the Jews: "when ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am (he), and (that) I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things" (8²⁸); as if it were a euphemism for the crucifixion, after which the true nature of Jesus would be realised by the Christians and their converts from the orthodox Jews who were persecuting them. Here again the title designates the earthly Jesus from the divine and eternal side, and a new content is poured into it which the first hearers could not have understood, as the author himself seems to have been aware. For later on, after the appeal to the Father to glorify His name, and the responding heavenly voice (12²⁸), which was for the sake of "the multitude," and not

merely for the three apostles (Mk 9⁷ ||), Jesus states that the "hour" just impending signifies a judgement of this world, and that His lifting up "out of" the earth will be but the beginning of drawing all men unto Himself. Then we have the contradictory interpretation added that this refers to the cross (³³). The Jews' objection that, according to the law, the Messiah abideth for ever is then met; for to such an expectation of a reign on earth the idea of a preliminary departure by means of death to heavenly exaltation was contrary, and thus there came the direct question of hearers obviously and naturally puzzled at such novel doctrine: "Who is this Son of man?" (³⁴).

And the mysterious answer is given: "Yet a little while is the light among you." This passage is also of value to us as an indirect acknowledgment of the fact that in the opinion of the evangelist "the Son of man" was not a current designation of the Messiah, and thus assists us to understand why our Lord utilised for Himself a title which still permitted of reinterpretation through His own Son-consciousness. So to the fourth evangelist, even where a reference might be argued to coming suffering, the Son of man is one who in that divine character from the beginning walks the stage of earthly life, and the expression has therefore no time-significance except in that it is used of the Logos as incarnate. From the writer's standpoint, that is, the title looks backward rather than forward.

We should perhaps have expected the term to be used,

if anywhere, in relation to passages which deal with the majesty programme of the future, as we found in the synoptic tradition.

Nevertheless so complete is the change of view that the term is not used at all of our Lord's coming in glory; indeed, such an event seems to be really excluded by the Johannine conception. The glorification of the Son of man is a present one, and His advent is universal and continuous, by the Spirit sacramentally mediated. Thus at the vista of universalism opened up by the coming of the Greeks (12²⁰) and the consequent informing of Jesus by the Greek-named apostles, He breaks forth in answer: "The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified" (23). Again, after the departure of Judas, another outburst of thanksgiving, uncomprehended by the disciples, is attributed to the Lord: "Now is the Son of man glorified (ἐδοξάσθη), and God is glorified in him; and God shall glorify him in himself, and straightway shall he glorify him" (13^{31f.}). Crises therefore even in the incarnate manifestation of the Word are moments of "glorification" by God and before men, albeit at the time unintelligible, yet realised by the retrospective and Spirit-guided meditation of His "little children" afterwards. Such glory is but the earthly emergence of that which He possessed with the Father "before the world was" (17⁵).

Once indeed we seem to revert to the old point of view as exhibited so prominently in the Matthean tradition. In a section which raises difficulties by the

inconsistencies in its eschatological outlook, we are told, as if in words of Jesus: "and he (the Father) gave authority to him (the Son) to execute judgement (*κρίσιν ποιεῖν*), because he is a son of man" (*υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, 5²⁷). His real humanity is His unique qualification for judging men. Here we are at least reminded of the Enochic idea (*e.g.* 41⁹) of judgement being committed to the Son of man; and, although such exercise of judicial prerogative is not stated to be at any future assize but is indeed implied to be present, the following verses, with their picture—unparalleled in this Gospel—of a general resurrection from the graves to life or to judgement in the future at the bidding of the Messianic Son, are not only realistically eschatological, but baldly physical in conception (^{28f.}). Otherwise the coming is always—as the farewell discourses indicate—personal and spiritual, not apocalyptic. From the close of the terrestrial manifestation of the eternal Logos, He has returned or rather has been present with His own in mystic indwelling companionship, or in other words by the Spirit, His other self, which is the Spirit of God. The continuous advent thus replaces the limited, materially conceived and ultimately Jewish coming in clouds for which the earlier Christian generation had looked, owing to the terminology which the historical Jesus (as the Synoptic Gospels testify) had been compelled by human limitations to utilise. The coming which is the immediate presence of God is inward and perennial (14^{3, 18f. 23, 28}), only the "little while" before resurrection as the necessary

preliminary to the sending of the Spirit intervening (16¹⁶). The later appendix, however, reverts to the older idea, which is inconsistent with the doctrine of the book as a whole and speaks of a tarrying "till I come" (21²²).

It will be remembered that, associated with the "parousia" in Matthew, we found the "day" of the Son of man in the Lucan parallel. This more primitive and specifically Jewish idea only emerges in the Fourth Gospel, and that quite inconsequently and possibly from interpolation (like 5^{28f.} above), in the address on the subject of spiritual food, applied to the Eucharist, wherein eternal life is connected with the promise: "I will raise him (the true believer) up at (ἐν) the last day" (6^{39f. 44. 54}). It is found also quite appropriately in the expression of Martha's hope (11²⁴), which serves to introduce the transcendent conception that life is in Jesus for the believer, because He is the Life (25^{f.}; cf. 14⁶). The words "in the last day" have possibly been inserted also in the statement that the word of Jesus judges the indifferent; unless, indeed, the whole sentence be an attempt to interpret the previous portion of the verse (12⁴⁸).

Enough has been adduced already to show that "the Son of man," where the title occurs, whether originally or from insertion, is a true relic of the older tradition which has yet been given virtually a new content as one of the names for the Word incarnate, but it is of quite occasional occurrence compared with the significant and dominant use by the author of "the Son" (absolutely,

about twenty times) or "the Son of God" (about ten times) in words ascribed to our Lord. Thus in this reflective narration does the divine being walk the earth in conscious progress to a human death, eliciting men's homage or else repelling them: not designate merely, but more than Messiah in the present; not confident in future glory alone as heavenly Son of man, but radiant with already manifest majesty as Son of God in human form.

But the title is also used in this book relative to conceptions with which the records of the other Gospels have no direct connexion. Angels are associated with the Son of man's future glorious appearing in the Matthean tradition especially; but in the apologetic seemingly directed in this writing against those who accorded undue honour to the Baptist our Lord, after saying: "Thou shalt see greater things than these," is made to aver to Nathanael: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (1⁶¹).

The vision imagined recalls Jacob's dream of old, and Stephen's sight of the opened heavens, as well as the narrative of the Baptism.

But the change of number noticeable above raises suspicion against the authenticity of the verse. One might say, however, that it appears intended to express in a more realistic manner the thought that in the incarnate life heaven dwelt on earth (cf. 1¹⁴).

In the other records the divine origin of Jesus is

expressed in one way or another ; but here, at the close of the Nicodemus episode, the Son of man as a heavenly being is said in plain words to have "descended out of heaven" (3^{13f.}): He is as such pre-existing and cosmic by nature. At the end of the former verse we may have emphasis laid on His return after the earthly life in the clause "who is in heaven"; but if that be not original, the return by "ascending" is alluded to later on in the story in the following manner.

Many even of the disciples are "scandalised" at the "hard saying" about eating His flesh and living because of Him, and Jesus is represented as adding to their surprise by the words: "(What) then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" (6⁶²), and yet subsequently explaining the fact expressed by the misunderstood figure that it is the spirit-life which emanates from Himself that matters. Thus this verse, wherein the once apocalyptic title is used for a visible ascent, has no real connexion with that unique teaching of communion, spiritual yet symbolised in and mediated by a physical and sacramental act, which is prominent in this Gospel, and to which we must now refer.

Earlier in the sixth chapter our Lord is represented as directing the minds of those inquirers who came to Him away from material loaves to spiritual food: "Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give (*v.l.* giveth) unto you" (6²⁷); and when requested to give them such bread, He tells them: "I am the

bread of life" (85). On the other hand, in arguing with "the Jews" regarding the possibility of conveying His essential life to the believer under the form of eating His flesh, He reveals the awfulness of the absence of such spiritual nutriment: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man (and drink his blood), ye have not life in yourselves" (53). Thus it appears that in his apologetic to meet Jewish attacks the Eucharist is, to this deeply religious and mystic evangelist, the vehicle and that quasi-physical for the appropriation of the imparted spirit-life of the eternal Son by the disciples, a veritable "extension of the Incarnation." But here again it is to be observed that the title has no eschatological connexion, and as a synonym for Jesus with this writer—assuming the reliability of the transmission—has no direct relation to the special way in which, according to the simpler narration of the Synoptists, our Lord used it of Himself.

There seems to be one other instance of the term in this Gospel, and that is again unique; the Son of man, according to the probably true text, being definitely stated to be the object of faith. To the excommunicated man our Lord is made to put the plain question: "Dost thou believe in (πιστεύεις εἰς) the Son of man?" (8 BD, etc., 985). Clearly this and the variant, "Son of God," have the same meaning here; the divine Logos appearing for a while in a real humanity is the object of individual faith. This stage of reflective and constructive religion manifested in this Gospel takes us considerably beyond

the personal claims of Jesus in the synoptic records. Thus the fear of hostility of orthodox Judaism has already lost its potency for those who have left the synagogue for the Christian faith, seeing that the crucified Messiah is the divine recipient of their worship (³⁸).

In no case, then, does the use of the appellation Son of man in the Johannine tradition throw any fresh light on the eschatological outlook of Jesus; nevertheless the usage of it as a self-designation in some passages bears out the synoptic witness to its authenticity.

3. Next, it is incumbent upon us to ask if the Jesus of the Johannine tradition affords us any further information regarding the ultimate states of men, life or death, blessedness or woe, joy or judgement. And we discover that all these conditions have been translated, as it were, into the eternal present, and eschatology as such seems to fall away as practically valueless and without importance. The revelation is in the present and for the present, and into the timeless present, if we may so speak, the future with all expected of it is absorbed.

Just as we found the idea of the future Kingdom to be rejected and transferred to something here and now, so we find in this Gospel that the noblest characteristic of the Kingdom in the Synoptists, Life, takes its place. Only it too is transmuted and spiritualised, and signifies a present and continuous instead of a strictly future state. It is, moreover, qualitative rather than quantitative.

Indeed, so great is the change of view that Life as that alone worth having is named nine times as often as in Mark or Luke, and to transcribe the passages would involve reproducing quite a considerable portion of the discourse material in the Fourth Gospel.

That this idea of Life which replaces that of the future Kingdom stands for an inward, mysterious and spiritual possession of the individual from now on, is a fact too well known to need proof by means of extracts here; it is one of the main notes of this book that life, eternal in quality rather than time, is communicated sacramentally to the faithful from Him who is the Life. This life, at once present and future, rendering the conception of the Kingdom small and limited by comparison, is the supreme blessing, a communicable property of Deity, bestowed by God on the Son (5²⁶), and imparted to the dead (21; cf. Ro 4¹⁷), but for the most part represented as being transmitted by the Son of God to those who are alive upon earth (4¹⁴ 5^{21, 26, 40} 6^{33, 35, 48, 51, 57} 10^{10, 28} 11²⁵ 14⁶ 17²), and that on condition of belief in Jesus, spiritual appropriation under the figures of eating and the like.

He is the communicator, because life is the inalienable divine quality inherent in Himself (6^{35, 48, 51, 57} 11²⁵ 14⁶), and marks alike His message and His mission (4¹⁴ 6⁶³ 8¹² 10^{10, 28} 17²).

Life therefore as an exclusively future and quantitative possession in a coming age or a coming kingdom does not appear in this Gospel at all, save for that inconsistent and probably secondary verse (5²⁹) concerning resurrection

of life or of judgement; since "fruit unto eternal life" (4³⁶), "seeing life" (3³⁶), "living for ever" (6⁵⁷), and "keeping the soul unto eternal life" (12²⁵) all include the possession thereof in the present earthly existence, whatever the fruition beyond physical death may be. Thus the mystic interpreter of the historic incarnation realised life to be qualitative and universal, dependent on a spiritual, sacramentally conditioned relationship to an eternal divine being, and no longer a mere attribute—although the highest specific blessedness—of an age or kingdom to come, depicted according to the categories of Jewish apocalyptic.

4. In regard of the mode of passage to conditions of eternal life after the death of the body, that is, relative to the resurrection of men, elements which are not easily reconciled appear in our author's writing, such as may be accounted for either by the theory of reactionary insertions in the text, or if original are evidences of the persistence of the more primitive eschatological view; just as the Pauline argumentation, for instance, about the "spiritual body" is not free from inconsistencies and defects inseparable from the state of knowledge at that time. In this work resurrection is in the main a process in God's activity for the dead, which the Son operates in a spiritual sense on the living (5²¹; cf. 2⁵). On the contrary, in several verse-endings, as we have seen already, it is a single official act of the Son in the future—a Messianic prerogative unclaimed in the synoptic records—on the physically dead believers who

strictly are in possession of eternal life by sacramental participation, and thus apart from the belief in bodily resurrection to a materially conditioned existence that act is really unnecessary (6^{39f.} 44. 54).¹ Such was the old popular faith which naturally Martha is represented as sharing (11²⁴), but which the teaching from the lips of Jesus as interpreted by this religious genius showed to be insufficient and in truth rendered obsolete. But the realisation of this transcendentalising and spiritualising of the belief required the lapse of centuries, and only the thoughtful and mystically minded perceive it now. And yet it is Jesus, the Logos, the Son, Himself the Resurrection (11²⁵), who imparts life eternal, who raises men: and although this emphasis on the mysterious communication by the Spirit of properties inherently divine was apt to cause the ethical conditions which were shown to be essential to entrance into life or the Kingdom or for resurrection in the other records of the doctrine of Jesus to pass out of sight, we must not fail to notice that faith in Jesus is the prerequisite which is fundamental (11^{25f.}). Spiritual quickening also has already taken place in the disciple (5²⁴; cf. 21), while on the other hand the nutriment of sacramental food consequent on faith and the present participation in life eternal seems to be regarded—at least, that is, according to the transmitted text—as

¹ Should Schweitzer's theory of the "speculative religious materialism" of this Gospel (*St. Paul and his Interpreters*, p. 202, which appeared after the present work was typed) find any acceptance, it would enable us to account for such verse-endings as part and parcel of the Johannine eschatological-sacramental scheme.

a *sine qua non* for the assurance of resurrection "at the last day" (6^{39ff.}). The history of the Church testifies to the superstitious and magical conceptions which a realistic interpretation of such teaching rendered possible for less mystic disciples.

In this Gospel there is but one figurative expression for the life beyond death. "In my Father's house," says the Lord, "are many mansions (μοναὶ πολλαί); if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you" (14²). Here we have a survival of the more concrete conceptions of the first age, only the national has been universalised, and we are naturally reminded of the "eternal tabernacles" in the parable of the shrewd overseer (Lk 16⁹), and recall the "abiding-places" of pious and of wicked in the heavens and hells of Jewish apocalypses and of later Rabbinic speculation. But this idea if pressed with undue literalism would be rendered out of harmony with the underlying mysticism of that union with God in and through the Son which constitutes life indeed.

5. When we turn our attention from the blessedness of those who by reason of their attitude to the revelation of the Son possess life both here and hereafter to the darker side of judgement, we are confronted by the same phenomenon of transmuted time-conceptions.

Judgement, to use the general term, is present, continuous, and inexorable in its working; and any allusion to a final "day" seems to be unnecessary, an outcrop from an earlier stratum of thought.

The revelation according to the Johannine interpretation is a revelation of light, and judgement is but an inevitable result of its presence. Salvation, indeed, by the historic life of the incarnate Son upon earth, expresses the divine purpose rather than the negative and unlovely aspect of condemnation (3¹⁷; cf. 12⁴⁷); nor is judging part of His direct personal activity during such terrestrial manifestation (8¹⁵); on the other hand, it is a result of His presence among men which cannot be avoided (*κρίμα*, 9³⁹). Again, although judgement is a continuous process under God through the earthly presence of the Person who is the touchstone for human testing (8⁵⁰), normally the very fact of that Person being in the world as Himself the revealing of light and imparter of life makes the present process of individual judgement to be spoken of as His (3¹⁹ 5²² 12⁸¹); while here and there a reference to "the last day" would suggest—if original—a final confirmation of that self-pronounced verdict (12⁴⁸; cf. 5²⁹, and on the brighter side, 6^{39ff.}); at least, this would appear to be the only way to reconcile two strictly contradictory conceptions.

Thus what constitutes the ground of judgement, which is continuous and as it were automatic, is the attitude of a man who has either enjoyed the light of the revelation or has rather loved darkness; in a word, according to his belief or not in (and consequent sacramental union or self-identification or otherwise with) the Son, the Word incarnate; and there is thus little or no expressed reference to the ethical conditions involved,

as these were exhibited in the more primitive reports of the authentic teaching of Jesus. The believer then escapes judgement (3¹⁸ 5²⁴), but the non-believer, rejecting the light, is judged already (3¹⁹), as he is thus on the side of "this world," which, by reason of the dualism that could not be dissociated from the religious thought of that age, lies in the power of its "prince," who also is a subject of judgement because of the continued presence of the Son by the Spirit (12³¹ 16¹¹).

Human conduct as the basis of judgement, in the way rendered familiar by the teaching concerning the citizens of the Kingdom as related in the other Gospels, emerges only in that one section which exhibits a likeness to that peculiarly Matthean tradition of judgement executed by the Son of man: "the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have practised ill (*φαῦλα πράξαντες*), unto the resurrection of judgement" (5^{28f.}).

When we examine the doom of the condemned, or rather the figurative expressions applied thereto, destruction or spiritual death, we discover that in these cases too the ground is not primarily conduct but faith—the individual attitude towards and appropriation of the Son's revelation, and consequently the relation to His spiritually ever-present Person.

Thus His followers having eternal life shall never be destroyed (10²⁸), for no believer in the only-begotten

Son is destroyed (³¹⁶), because of the possession of the life imparted through Him, who loses none committed unto Him (⁶³⁹; cf. ¹⁸⁹) save "the son of destruction" (¹⁷¹²).

Again, the death which the Fourth Gospel has in view is not the merely physical change which is mentioned in the Synoptists, but the death of the soul—however incompatible the idea may be with purely Greek thought—death which is indeed worthy of the name.

This may be presumed to be the fate of the unbelieving, but only the brighter side of the contrast is named, just as was the case in alluding to destruction. What the faithful with their joy of the possession of eternal life have been saved from is left only to be imagined. Such have passed for ever "from the death to the life" (⁵²⁴); they have eaten also of the heavenly food which renders the death of the body simply an incident in life (⁶⁵⁰). That indeed they may taste (⁸⁵²), but the real death they shall never see (⁵¹), for life and belief are mutually dependent (¹¹²⁶). Moreover, a death which is worse than physical seems to be indicated by the words in the mouth of the Lord before His Jewish opponents, that they should seek Him, but should die in their sin(s), unless they believed in Him (^{821, 24}).

We cannot but admit, therefore, that on the lines of the Christian apology based upon the historic life which constitutes the Fourth Gospel intellectual assent—the

acceptance of the fundamental fact of the book, "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God" (20³¹)—appears to be more highly apprised than the lofty ethical conditions of relationship with God and man which were demanded in the primitive teaching of Jesus. But this is only apparently so; for the sublime mysticism which is the very atmosphere of the writing assures us instinctively of the manifestation in the Christian of the loving life—apart from any external traditions attached to the name of the reputed author—which would render words unspoken therein on behalf of personal practice consonant with belief superfluous. The divorce of faith from conduct was for much lesser souls and insincere withal, when worldliness in the Church had produced a degeneration of religious enthusiasm.

We may be well aware of edges showing within the Johannine transmission which would appear to indicate different strata or insertions, and the placing side by side of conceptions to us strictly incongruous from quite distinct worlds of thought; but into these things it has not been needful to enter, for it is the general view which dominates the work, and not occasional traces of older or other ideas that we have desired to discover. And as a whole there is no escape from the conclusion that the reorientation is virtually if not in every detail complete. Such was implicit in the permanent character of our Lord's teaching, when that came to be realised, but it was the change of

external conditions when commending the Gospel to a Hellenistic world which rendered it explicit.

Eschatology as such has practically vanished. If the delay of the Lord's coming harassed men's minds, if the Jewish party were insistent on narrow nationalistic views, difficulties like these are brushed aside as of little inherent weight, and the grand vision which mystic faith and communion inspired of life present yet eternal, springing from the sacramentally sustained union of the Christian with God in Christ or by the Spirit, replaces the older and authentic expectations of a kingdom to be and a visible judgement on a transfigured earth, and the local and national is absorbed in the human and universal vista.

The Son of man, too, as we have been led to recognise, accepting the use of the title as original, becomes in this work really an appellation for the eternal Son in His incarnate manifestation, and is bereft (save for one passage) of its specially future significance.

Furthermore, speculative descriptions of the bliss of the faithful or of the woes of the condemned are out of place, as they had indeed been discouraged also by the reticence of Jesus; for no blessedness can exceed the life which is from God through the Son, and no doom can be more awful than the absence thereof, which is truly death.

Finally, the Johannine reinterpretation is found to have been fitted not only for acceptability to the

Hellenised civilisation of the sub-apostolic age, but, while constituting a Gospel about Jesus, it freed the essential revelation of Jesus from its very local and transitory, yet initially necessary and indeed protective, raiment of eschatology, and unveiled once for all its underlying eternal and universal qualities. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that it is just this writer's practical mysticism of Christian love, still unfathomed by humanity at large, which holds within itself that reconciliation of otherworldliness with the multifarious activities of our complex life for which a materialistic age like the present sorely craves, fretful and restless as it is with a soul-hunger of the meaning of which it is yet scarcely conscious.

This sense of the still inadequately appreciated value of the reinterpretation which the Fourth Gospel supplies will come to expression in various ways in the closing reflexions which follow.

CHAPTER IX

SOME PRACTICAL REFLEXIONS ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OUTLOOK OF JESUS FOR MODERN THOUGHT

THUS far we have exhibited and examined the data related to our subject from the teaching of our Lord as recorded in the Gospels.

We have found that it was—whatever disagreement there may be about occasional interpretations—to a large extent apocalyptically coloured, as we should expect from the background of His human life.

Nevertheless we have also appreciated the fact that such so-called eschatological doctrine was new in respect of its depth, its mode of presentation, and in part its content, because it was throughout pervaded by ethical conditions.

Yet as soon as the Gospel broke through the limitations of Judaism we cannot fail to apprehend that the primitive apocalyptic realism came to be treated in one of two ways. Either it was sharpened, exaggerated and developed, and thus its national complexion retained—as with Jewish Christians of the Matthean type; or it was gradually discarded, and the permanent religious

teaching inherent therein applied to the eternal present, and so universalised—as with the apostle of the Gentiles and more completely in the circle in which the Fourth Gospel arose. Let us see how it is the latter practical and spiritualising revaluation, or perhaps it would express it more adequately to say this developing appreciation of the inwardness of the teaching, which is most in harmony with the outlook of the modern religious mind.

A. THE REVALUATION OF THE ESCHATOLOGY

We will trace this in the order of the leading ideas which served to form the divisions of our inquiry.

1. *The Kingdom of God.*—The phenomena exhibited by the Synoptic Gospels especially go to show with considerable clearness that our Lord's general conception of the coming Kingdom was not far different from that current in His day among the Jews, else He would have had cause to define it afresh. But the transformation which He wrought was by enriching the content, by "fulfilling," and that by way of transcendentalising and spiritualising the conception, whilst at the same time using material imagery deeply rooted in popular descriptive language. The Johannine statement, that the Kingdom was not of this world, was true enough; for Jesus looked for a regency emanating from heaven, and established through Himself as God's representative on a renewed earth, in which the conditions would be those of righteousness, blessedness and peace. Yet we cannot

get away from the fact that this Kingdom, this divine dominion, was to be speedily set up, and to be inherited by the holy community of His immediate disciples and adherents, and their converts made subsequently amid increasing stress and trial before the manifestation should take place. But we may not identify the Kingdom so conceived with the Christian Church.

The only "church" which we may assert that our Lord founded was such an assembly of faithful Israelites, a holy society, the nucleus at least of the Kingdom that was to be. Of organisation and plan for development there seems to have been neither trace nor thought. For the interval the guidance of the Father's Spirit would suffice in times of persecution and of danger. The end, in the sense of the commencement of the Kingdom, could not be long delayed.

We are unable to attribute to Jesus with any regard for historical accuracy the conception of a Church in the sense that we know it; developed, diversified, spread over many latitudes, and embracing gradually members of most of the known races of the globe.

The evolutionary idea as applied to the Church of Christ in its varied manifestation amongst men is, of course, modern. To ascribe it to our Lord by a strained exegesis of the parables of growth would not only be alien to the Jewish spirit which conditioned His revelation, but it would be a bald anachronism. The identification of the aggregate of churches with the Kingdom, in so far as it represented a partial becoming here and

now of that which awaited consummation, only begins to show itself in the second generation, when present activities and present expansion in what was then deemed the whole inhabited world compelled the attention of Christian leaders.

For the days before the Passion we cannot assert more than that the powers of the Kingdom were effectively present in members of the immediate following of the Master, and that such persons were already ideally partakers thereof, in that its citizenship was assured to them at its advent. Strictly speaking, therefore, our Lord did not found a Church; and yet to us looking back over Christian history He did so, because the little band of faithful ones proved to be the germ of the "Church militant here in earth," and thus to the religious historian a terrestrial and preparatory phase of the perfect dominion of God for which we ever hope, but whose establishment is not yet.

We must be ready to admit candidly that in the manner in which it was openly conceived by Jesus, as well as in the expectant longings of His compatriots and His apostles, the Kingdom of God has never been more than a prophetic, stimulating and valuable product of the Jewish religious imagination, a glorious dream based on national monarchical experiences and built up by and in turn upholding national hopes, but historically (in our scientific sense of the word) a fiction. Yet just this realistically projected hope which inspired such patriotic enthusiasm in periods of disaster was the chief

object on the religious (and political) horizon of our Lord's time. It was therefore essential and also natural that He should use it and keep it central, while freeing it from all political limitations, and giving it a transformation which afforded the conception an abiding value, even many centuries after all possibility of its literal realisation in human history had passed away.

The revelation of Jesus, of God in and through Him, was the jewel of eternal worth whose setting was the Kingdom idea; the seed-corn for a universal harvest planted in the soil of a national, local and comparatively temporary hope. This Kingdom conception, linked as it was with all the Jewish realism of a bygone age, is, we must frankly grant, to the modern man unacceptable. But the transmuting of the conception, which our Lord wrought by His unwavering insistence on ethical conditions for life and conduct, Godward and manward, rendered it of permanent value and universal worth, even though the expected catastrophe never came; teaching for all time that "inheriting the Kingdom" (to use one of the old expressions) is ultimately dependent on the human response to the divine message. When that is known, acceptability with God turns on what we designate a man's "character"; and Jesus simply left, as we may well do, all the difficulties arising from evil up-bringing, environment, lack of opportunity for hearing the invitation, and the like, in His unfaltering confidence to the love and perfect justice of the Father in heaven.

As we look back from the vantage-ground of the years, we can perceive that the universalising of the message was implicit in the very rejection of the Master and of His earliest disciples by those to whom they were sent, and in the exigencies of primitive persecution and dispersion, as "the first Church History" relates for us.

But we have not sufficient warrant for stating that our Lord planned, or even within the limitations of His human experience foresaw, the catholic Church of Christian centuries. Nevertheless, however the Kingdom idea as then enunciated may have proved illusory and become out of harmony with a religious outlook which has been so vastly enlarged by our fuller and continuous revelation, it was the highest category for blessedness then available.

And this loftiest aim of earthly existence, inclusion among the elect, the subjects of the reign of God, participation in the blessed life of the new age, acceptability that is with the Eternal Spirit whom Jesus revealed as Father, was only attainable by the individual according to his attitude to our Lord's proclamation concerning it. Membership, therefore, of the Kingdom or partaking of life may be applied to present states in so far as a man, according to all the records of the doctrine of Jesus, when cognisant of the revelation, is himself the determinant of his destiny. In other words, although the argument from silence is admittedly precarious, there is no hint in our Lord's words of any

further opportunity of choice, of change of heart, or of further probation for self-fitting for the citizenship of the saints. It may be said that this is only natural in view of the presumed proximity of the divine inbreaking into human affairs. But it is important to lay stress on the fact, because the principle remains valid when the earthly exit is deemed the end for each individual. The moral and religious decision is still within the "now" of uncertain mundane existence.

In connexion with this, the use of current language implying partitions in the under-world as a portion of the furniture of a parable, and the adoption of one of such terms in the reported word from the cross, form too inadequate a foundation on which to build any reliable reasoning about an intermediate state for any who should die before the bringing of the Kingdom. Of direct teaching in confirmation of such speculation, however desirable to afford support to our assurance that every soul will have full opportunity of choice, there is none recorded from Jesus ; and, if any occasion arose for it, behind His presumably intentional reserve it would be best to shelter our own silence.

2. *The Son of man*.—Closely related to the thought of the Kingdom is the conception of the Messianic king as the Son of man, the expression which Jesus apparently selected as the most suitable for His re-interpretation of the heavenly personage who figured in the hopes and speculations of His people. He regarded Himself without doubt as the one who should

fulfil the *rôle* of that apocalyptic being, the celestial Man. The term permitted the combination of a reference to human weakness, to humility and suffering, with the prevailing thought of majesty, authority and dominion when He should come from heaven, after the divine act of resurrection, to establish the Kingdom. Nor could He utilise in speech even to the disciples anything but the current imagery concerning that heavenly figure whose special activities were still future, although such contained elements originally non-Jewish and inharmonious one with another.

The title was most easily associated with His glorious advent after death, which, when the earthly life was looked upon as one coming, naturally grew to be regarded as, and termed by the early Church, His return, and that with divine power yet with human sympathy to vindicate His followers before their foes and to judge mankind.

But what meaning has this apocalyptic figure and His "coming down" to this planet for us to-day? The Son of man in heaven with God, ascended thither after earthly incarnation, returning thence from the upper storey of a threefold world—these conceptions are inseparable from a cosmology which has been long out of date. We can only interpret the old symbolism by endeavouring to appropriate the truths which lie behind the temporary forms of metaphorical expression.

As long as we are willing and careful to declare that these things are but ancient imagery inherited from the

Jewish religion and hallowed by ages of Christian use, it is well. But we must recognise, and help our people to recognise, that this category of space—up and down, ascent and descent, going and returning—cannot really be applied to the spiritual verities which human speech struggles inadequately to express thereby. Our grand though gradually attained appreciation of the phenomena of the universe, in which we inhabit this little globe whirling round a comparatively insignificant star from which it was flung forth into so-called space, forbids us to look for any such return of the Son of man as the first age earnestly expected.

We are conscious that the Eternal is not apart, that the Spirit of Jesus is not absent, but comes, nay, is present continually. And if the earlier Pauline and the Matthean teaching urged especially that His "presence," His visit, would very soon be one of judgement on Jew and Gentile alike, yet primarily on behalf of Christians as such, it is incumbent upon us to retranslate these conceptions into terms applicable to the present.

To ourselves the reported statement of Jesus before the Sanhedrin is spiritually true and essentially justified by the course of history: the coming "from henceforth" has been and is ever taking place, the judgement has been and is continuous. In the rise and fall of kingdoms, in the spread and decay of churches, in human discoveries which are divine revelations when man has attained the power to know, in the religious experiences of individual souls, we are led to perceive the

operation of God in Christ, through the Spirit, and so continually and inevitably men are in the aggregate and as individuals judging themselves.

Thus it comes to pass that it is again the interpretation of the fourth evangelist, preserving as we may well believe transmitted seed-thoughts from actual discourses of Jesus to His own intimates, which is found not only to have been most in sympathy with Greek-Christian contemporary culture, but, despite the ground-tones of the Palestinian reminiscences, is relatively most in harmony with that idealistic religious or spiritual interpretation of the universe which is gaining acceptance to-day, and marks a reaction from the materialistic explanation which has been prominent in our own time.

The manner in which our Lord presented His teaching by principle and parable contained the germ of an ever-present application thereof, as was discovered when the long current expectation of a speedy world-end passed away. We can see how the school of a world-wide experience taught St. Paul that gradual if partial transference of the time-centre of his doctrines from the future to the present, as the stress on the coming of Christ, conceived in the earlier letters with vivid nationalistic imagery, gave place to emphasis upon intercourse with Him now and perfected communion at the death of the individual believer.

These are indications of the way in which men were being prepared for the complete rejection in the Fourth Gospel—but for traces from earlier strata of tradition or

modes of expression—of Jewish Messianic conceptions, and for the placing of Spirit-imparted life and of coming and judgement within the progressive earthly experience of writer and of reader.

The presence of the light, the revelation of God in the incarnate Logos, is in this book the test here and now for each individual who has come within range of the glad tidings: in the attitude thereto consists self-judgement.

Thus the national eschatology is practically abandoned, and individual eschatology becomes central; yet, strictly speaking, it should cease to be so designated, because individual destiny is regarded as determined in the present, although the issues are abiding. The spiritual and sacramental relationship of Jesus to His own is one quite independent of time and place limitations, and the believer escapes judgement, while for a physical return of the Son of man, such as was looked for, there is strictly no need: the old apocalyptic motive is not required, although the issues of life are with God all the same. In other words, the attitude which was desirable when men expected the glorified Lord to come to earth at any moment has simply become one that must be continuous, because He is never absent from the individual life.

The realistic machinery of the Return has passed away once for all with the outworn cosmology: we can but use the old symbolism, remembering that it is only imagery, and regard the truth of the eternal and therefore present Judge, which is the moral fact behind it.

For the modern man, the surrender of the whole

personality to God in the knowledge of and faith in the revelation through Jesus, dispels the terror of judgement, and whilst eliminating the primitive expectation of a materially conceived return from heaven on or with the clouds, replaces the profound ethical value which—apart from its credibility or otherwise—it once possessed in a more permanently valid manner.

The first age looked for an earthly kingdom as the issue of the second advent, and that it seems temporary at best, ere being itself taken up into the perfect reign of God—without devil, under-world or death. We, on the other hand, are being disciplined as believers in the unique revelation through Christ, to expect and hope for the progressive perfecting of the rule of God, an end which is beyond our ken and the ways thereto beyond our discerning; but no Christian true to his faith can fail to await the final harmony, though the process be unmeasured by humanly reckoned time.

3. *Life*.—This final harmony, when God shall be all in all and human wills perfectly attuned, is designated, in the local and temporary appellation of Jesus and of the first age, the Kingdom of God, eternal life, a blessedness at least in part materialistically imagined, that of which various aspects were represented or implied by various figurative expressions. Our modern manner of attempting to conceive of the life which is indeed worthy of the name may be very different from the crude realism of early days, and of the untutored and superstitious within Christian communities even at the present time.

But the object of thought always remains the same, whether in the mind of the Master or behind the ardent earnestness of the most literalistic mission-preaching; and it is that life of the godly, of the righteous, of believers, which signifies the completeness of spiritual experience, the fulness of realised sonship, perfect communion with God and all the faithful who partake therein; or to utilise the expression for the highest bliss, known alike to Jew, Christian and Muslim—the vision of God, however sensuously such bliss may have been oftentimes popularly depicted.

But here again it is the interpretation which finds expression in the Fourth Gospel that appeals most to us now. This life eternal has a present aspect and is a present possession. The perfecting of the divine will in and through us as self-surrendered personalities, has begun as soon as we have risen through faith to the consciousness of our Christian inheritance.

Just as there was a proleptic beatitude (so to speak) even in the present circumstances of life for those who responded to the call of our Lord during His ministry and were expecting a speedy citizenship, so for us the blessedness has already begun, albeit restricted and conditioned by the material environment of mundane experience.

The life rooted at its outset in penitence and faith, whose aim is Godward and which is exhibiting its fruit in daily conduct manward, is fundamentally the same now as that sought for by Jesus from all who heard and

understood the message of the Kingdom; only that now the change in the conditions is regarded as being effected at the death of the individual believer instead of at the ushering in of an externally established heavenly dominion upon earth. The mode of conceiving of it is different, but the content of blessedness is identical: life for God now and hereafter, in the joy of the present possession of assured forgiveness, and in the changed attitude towards one's fellows by reason of the divine love personally experienced, irradiating and exhaling its subtle influence around.

Thus, although the pivot of religious experience for us is in the present rather than in the future, and that verifiable experience is individual or catholic (according to the point of sight) rather than national; although our religious conceptions have undergone a vast extension and deepening because of our immeasurably larger and grander world-view: the same two essential factors are preserved as in the teaching of Jesus—the personal side, eternal life; and the social side, the Kingdom, the society of the redeemed, the communion of saints.

In another point also it is to be noted that there is no loss arising from our modern revaluation. The continuity of personal consciousness and personal identity is an unquestioned postulate in our Lord's utterances, whether in argument concerning the Resurrection or in the pictorial furnishing of His parables. Such is a postulate of our faith also, but the "how" is not revealed to us.

We possess, indeed, as data additional since "the days of His flesh" the effects—fundamental for the Christian Church—upon the primitive disciples of the spirit-presence and guidance of their recently crucified Master, on the one hand, and certain as yet but little understood psychic phenomena under close scientific investigation in modern times, on the other. Yet although we may also find assistance from the analogy of continued personal identity through physiological change, it would be best, with our present inadequate material for a solution, to leave the manner of persisting identity, which is a certainty for the man of faith "in Christ" but transcends our terrestrial experience, to the power of the loving Father in whom we trust, as Jesus did with unshaken confidence.

There is no question that just as in the doctrine of our Lord only the righteous, the pious, the penitent recipients of the proclamation of the coming Kingdom were regarded as participating in, inheriting or enjoying it, so now it is ethically difficult for us to conceive of the wicked, the deliberate choosers of evil ways, as ever in their present moral state finding any felicity in the life of blessedness, of complete surrender to the divine will, either under the conditions of earthly or of purely spiritual existence beyond the range of our categories of thought. To put it colloquially, for such heaven would be hell. So the emphasis lies as with our Lord upon the change of state which is essential. But about the probability of such change after the vital co-

ordinations of the physical body have ceased, it would be wise—as far as the evidence from the Gospels is concerned—to keep silent. No sufficient material is afforded us for any reliable argument from the recorded utterances of Jesus.

Our Lord had no teaching to give, as far as we know, such as Persian speculation supplied and later Rabbinic opinions furnished on the issues of this life for those neither specially good nor specially bad, the middle class whose deeds balanced. Only the righteous and the wicked are recognised as participating respectively in bliss or woe, and the possibility of final restoration for all men is unmentioned. Indeed it is most probable that the question did not arise, because no lengthy waiting-time was contemplated.

Even for us, stimulated as we are by a more developed moral sensitiveness, speculation on the subject remains without value, and must be often harmful and misleading, because we do not possess the terms requisite for the solution of the problem. Here again, therefore, we should do well to imitate our Lord, and repose trustfully in the perfect knowledge and love of God, seeing that curiosity is unavailing.

And we should lose, or at least diminish if we knew more, the tremendous ethical potency of the unbroken doctrine of Jesus, wherein the present experience alone is spoken of, and is assumed to be the sole period for human choice.

With this agrees the fact that throughout only the

righteous are accounted as entering the Kingdom and participating in eternal life, while the impenitent are excluded from the Kingdom; and life is never predicated of them, although their persistence and therefore conscious identity would seem to be taken for granted because of the forensically conceived divine condemnation which was looked for by the religious thought of the time. There is thus in the utterances of our Lord some foundation for the theory of "conditional immortality" in so far as individual acceptability for the Kingdom is ethically conditioned in the present.

Here we must refer briefly to the aspect of life as a reward, a figure which our Lord did not shrink from utilising, although this fact may have given offence to modern ethical purism. Assuredly it was a mode of appeal available for Jesus—as it is for us—to make use of the imagery of recompense to express the boon of beatitude present and future for the faithful, although God alone is recognised to be the all-sufficient and unfailing source of grace.

We ourselves know instinctively from our own lower tendencies—the "evil desire" of the Jewish moralists—that such blessedness can never be equated with poor human deserving, despite the Rabbinic doctrine of treasures of goodness available from the superabundant observances and good works of the saints. The language of retribution on the brighter side is serviceable now, as it was in the sparing use which our Lord made thereof, as a lever for encouragement, not a primary motive; as

proclaiming an ideal to live for, not a payment by desert.

Even by way of an assurance and an incentive to confidence of faith, the idea of reward can only find expression under earthly categories which for spiritual states are no longer valid.

Metaphor is available to express just that which cannot be strictly defined in human terms, and to apply a hard literalism thereto is an exegetical mistake. Nor is this true in the present instance alone, but it is so with relation to all the imagery—at once Oriental and apocalyptic—of the Gospels, however realistically the uncultured have accepted the symbolism, with or without an adequate appreciation of the spiritual or moral truths which it was intended by prophets or by Jesus to convey.

The ideal originally set forth by our Lord in terms of the Kingdom of God for those who, with changed heart, willingly practised the higher righteousness, cannot be thought of as attainable under normal earthly conditions now any more than then. We must look onward and—morally as well as metaphorically—upward. For nothing less than the perfection of our divine sonship is set before us by our Lord as the aim and issue of our personal life, and we are well aware that it is unattainable here.

We are still haunted by a heaven conceived of in terms of space for the fulfilment of that filial and fraternal relationship and for the completion of our being. But we must remember that we are making

use of mere picture-words for the mind, and guard against the intricate yet oftentimes trivial speculations, both Jewish and Christian, wherein the celestial state has been described in terms of extension and quasi-physical conditions, the only worth of whose tedious detail lies in the fact that they afford an indication of the standard of moral and religious values obtaining at the time of their composition.

Sufficient has been said in dealing with the Johannine interpretation as such (p. 333 ff.) to demonstrate that in the view of that work a man's spiritual resurrection mediated through faith in the Son is a present possibility, and that such identified with spiritual re-birth initiates the present enjoyment of divinely imparted life.

And although it lies outside the limitations of our inquiry, it may be noted how this conception is supported by the Epistles of St. Paul, which testify amply to the fact that for him the risen life of the Christian was a present experience. Moreover, it is the summons to the experimental verification of this fact which constitutes the most effective modern appeal to the individual.

4. *Judgement*.—We find that the position now is very similar in relation to the fate of the unrighteous. The fact of judgement remains the same to-day, as also the subjects and the standard thereof.

But the form of presentation and of appeal has perforce changed by reason of the hard facts of history and the progressive knowledge of the universe.

The most that men are instructed by cautious teachers

to look for now is a divine declaration which will in some way openly and finally confirm and complete the self-judgement of each individual. But even this doctrine is precarious and speculative, in that it transfers to conditions wholly spiritual, actions derived from the judicial procedures of human civilisation. Whether the Judgement to which Jesus looked, and in which He sought that all should escape adverse sentence, was limited to the Jews and those who had had relations with them in history, and to the recipients of His own message, or was rightly regarded, in the manner of later Church doctrine, as a world-judgement of all men living and dead, is a matter upon which the opinion of responsible scholars is divided. At any rate, the emphasis has passed from the world-judgement taught in the New Testament to the individual judgement whose basis is in the present life, as enunciated with most clearness in the discourses of our Lord which are exhibited in the Fourth Gospel.

For practical purposes of religious exhortation and as a moral lever the idea of a great assize even of the human beings—dead, now living and yet to be—upon this small planet is too vast for the apprehension of the ordinary man. It is therefore only the primitive Jewish-Christian symbolism which has to be relinquished, and the power of present and personal appeal, based upon acknowledged and verified data of spiritual, mental and physical retribution even in this life, gains rather than loses thereby, especially among more educated people.

We cannot, nor would we if we could, put ourselves back to the intense enthusiasm or to the abject fear of the first age, a fear which has also characterised periods of mental darkness in the Church's history, and of grave social crises, and emerges afresh in crude revival preaching among races or classes of lower culture and superstitious dread even in our own time. Stern warning there was indeed of the unutterable loss involved in the non-acceptance of the tidings, but the bald appeal to terror as such is never found in the teaching of our Lord: a device so universally condemned to-day in the training of the child mind was not utilised by the world's religious educator.

Assuredly the worth of this life is immeasurably enhanced by basing the whole appeal on the present, and rendering it, as Jesus did, the positive and potent summons of God's love and grace to the divinest in each individual, to the innate sonship, and not the negative and ethically valueless motive of dread, for "perfect fear casts out love."

Again, to us the person of the Judge is immaterial. No doubt the main, if not the sole view, going back to the Master's own teaching, is that God Himself pronounces sentence and executes judgement.

But with the universalising of the national Messianic idea through its association with the belief in Jesus as Lord, the dominant conception came to be that He as the Son of man, in the wider cosmic and representative sense, would judge mankind. Yet seeing that the

spiritual and moral revelation of God's nature was and is through the Incarnation, the earthly life of Jesus, this in itself provides the basis of judgement here and now for each man, as revealing the divinity of humanity to which it is possible by spiritual self-identification with Him to approximate. So the fact as it affects individual choice, change of heart, recognition of life's spiritual potentialities, or however the voluntary readjustment be termed, is the same whether it be said that Christ judges men or that God does so. Ultimately the revelation and the judgement are alike God's, and the process of judgement goes on continually. In this manner every portion of life's conduct is given ethical, spiritual and eternal value for good or ill. The divine humaneness, for example, in the description of one principle of judgement at least, ministering love, acts of self-denying Christ-like service, in the last Matthean parable—whether it were originally limited in range or not—must be acknowledged to have a present, powerful and universal human appeal.

Thus once more the apparent change wrought by transferring the emphasis to the present brings no loss but rather gain; for beneath the eschatological covering it was there all the time inherent in the doctrine of Jesus, awaiting the unveiling which history effected.

What we have said in regard of the necessary individualising and spiritualising of the Gospel eschatology on the brighter side holds good for the sadder and

negative aspect of retribution for the wilful sinners by way of doom and eternal loss. All the gruesome machinery of a gross religious realism which persisted through the Middle Ages among Jews, Christians and Muslims alike, and still persists in crude belief and, it is sad to admit, in much teaching of the young,—with its spectacular and lurid Judgement scene, its spatial and material hell(s), its ever-burning fire, its revived bodies for continually recurring tortures of physical pain,—must cease to be utilised in deliberate and thoughtful instruction; for the intelligent are deterred, and the timid are terrified thereby; and even to produce an emotional crisis in criminal and degraded natures, the appeal of love is more potent than that of fear. Nor can such use of ghastly pictures of future doom, although prevalent during many Christian centuries in preaching and in art, plead the essential teaching of the Lord for precedent. It can be avoided then with less demur.

Yet again the pillar of the balance of bliss or woe is found to be fixed in the personal life of present existence; whether we appeal to the direct utterances of Jesus on the character and conduct which befit the Kingdom-seeker or to the indirect testimony of His parables. The hell of the future—whatever that may be—is inherent by inexorable processes in the present activities of perverted natures, and the pathos of unused opportunity is just as deep to-day as when the story of the Rich Man was told. As in the case of

blessedness, so here continued consciousness is assumed for the realisation after death of self-wrought condemnation, but beyond that it is well for us to be cautiously silent.

The eschatological imagery of the New Testament is admittedly variable and inconsistent, and in the nature of the case occasional and unsystematic; yet nowhere can the words of our Lord be interpreted certainly as teaching torture and punishment unending, any more than they justify us in affirming the final restoration of all men because of the doctrine of the infinite mercy of God discoverable therein.

Upon these things it is unprofitable to speculate: it suffices for us to know that as far as Jesus reveals, it is perfectly clear that our behaviour in the present, according to the light that has reached us, is decisive. We do not now possess the solution of the terms: God "wouldeth not the death of a sinner," and "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." The problem, like that of determinism and free-will, seems with our present knowledge insoluble; but the apparent irreconcilability may prove illusory, and be found to be resolved in a higher synthesis yet to be revealed.

The correlate of the conditional blessedness or immortality which our Lord appears to have accepted and taught would seem to be strictly the destruction or annihilation of the wicked. Strong biblical arguments may indeed be adduced for this; but such a

doctrine would appear to deprive us of the noblest moral leverage applicable through the consciousness of sin, the sense of personal guilt and loss, as a motive for repentance, faith and transformed life. For abhorrence of sin is better and loftier than merely dread of the final issues thereof.

In dealing with the darker side, we conclude, therefore, that the awfulness of the outcome of judgement is best indicated by the stress which Jesus laid upon separation, exclusion in some untold manner from the divine communion, from the eternal Source of blessedness, and from the fellowship of the highest and noblest of mankind.

But a present appeal more subtle than that of fear, and a more potent impulse to change of heart, springs from the germinative and fruitful thought of the "inestimable benefit" of divine love with its pleading invitation, enkindling the response which is the redemptive factor on the human side; as the innate filial love, deep hidden in the spirit of each, flashes out in penitence and gratitude, fired by the Spirit which is Love, through the knowledge of Christ, however transmitted to the soul, and the immanent kinship of the human spirit comes to outward expression in answer to the attraction of divine holiness.

The whole subject of doom is thus lifted above the plane of physical realism, except in so far as the haunting of guilt is related to "things done in the body." It is also transferred from the future to the

present, when judgement is regarded as a continuous and inevitable process, conscious or unconscious, in every individual life.

Beyond this we should do wisely to refrain from assertion, and before the mystery of the future to bow our heads humbly in ignorance yet in completest confidence.

B. THE RELATIVE NATURE OF THE ESCHATOLOGY

It will probably be admitted after the foregoing investigation into the relevant passages, that only an extremely radical and scarcely fair treatment could eliminate the eschatological element from the teaching of Jesus. And careful criticism has established too securely the fundamental trustworthiness of the Gospel sources to permit of this, although, on the other hand, the importance of the element in question has been exaggerated in recent years. We have realised that even then plenty of scope is left for the persistence, or even the developed application (Mt.), of popular apocalyptic teaching contained therein, through the inability of the reporters, apostolic or other, to attain at once to the full spirituality inherent in the doctrine of the Master, as also for the influence of the idiosyncrasies and special purposes of preacher, narrator or compiler.

But this accounts only for some of the phenomena. The eschatologically coloured material must in the main go back to Jesus Himself: it is an integral part of the Gospel. The form of His message was in fact definitely

eschatological—as relating to “the end of the age,” and the proclamation of the glad tidings of the Father’s love was clothed in apocalyptic metaphor. Yet after all merely a portion of His doctrine dealt with the future. The strictly religious, ethical and practical instruction was associated with individual attitude and conduct in the present for His hearers, although the then existing present was to Him and to them but an undefined interval preceding the visible and sudden advent of the Kingdom, and therefore of the Judgement connected therewith.

As time went on, and the earnest expectation of a catastrophic coming of the reign of God, of a glorious return of Jesus as the Christ upon the clouds, of a spectacular world-end and a general assize faded, despite the fanning of the flame by writings like 2 Peter, the more intelligent members of the Christian communities, immersed in the practical activities of ecclesiastical affairs, of leadership, organisation, and guidance amid persecution, found little necessity to dwell on the old eschatology; while the uneducated masses clung to the inherited materialistic notions of a physical Return and a corporeal resurrection. And probably neither class attempted to reconcile therewith the fact of their living a busy and organised existence in a rapidly spreading Church centuries after the once expected time of the end. The occasional outbursts of revengefulness against external foes and the bitter threatenings of sectarian polemics within the Church

seem to have been an unavoidable if lamentable by-product of the very earnestness of realistic faith. Yet we might dare to say that for the greater part of the Church's history, eschatology has had rightly a secondary place. Although a Christian legalism soon grew up to replace that rendered obsolete by our Lord, this external regulation of ordinary religious life in society as it existed dealt with the present rather than with the future, with experience rather than with eschatology.

To-day, however, critical and analytical research into the foundations of Christian belief, as well as a quickened and more widely diffused moral sensitiveness, together with scientific inquiry into the physical probabilities of the cessation of life on this planet, and so forth, have all combined to render the so-called eschatology of the Gospels, and more especially the outlook of the Founder as far as it can be recovered, a living problem of more than literary interest.

But while we regard it as incontestable that a local, national and contemporary apocalyptic realism was intimately and inevitably linked with the Gospel message as proclaimed by our Lord, both in respect of Himself and of those whom He addressed, we find that we can do on critical and moral grounds now what has been gradually and unconsciously accomplished in the ordinary practice of religious life for centuries—relinquish the ancient realistic form of the eschatology, and that not only without any actual loss, but rather with great gain.

For it has been amply proved by Christian experience, especially of the mystical type, that it is unessential to the spiritual life as such, as well as unessential to the revelation itself, which perforce had to be presented in order to be understood in a manner fitted to the culture, beliefs and circumstances of the time and place of its manifestation.

The frank admission which the records demand, that Jesus was the child of His age and nation, announcing His message by means of current conceptions which were really inadequate to express fully His own consciousness of Sonship and of Messiahship, and through the instrumentality and terminology of a religious system whose exaggerated traditional legalism He opposed, avoids the complications of and renders unnecessary any theory of accommodation.

The eschatological forms began by the way in which He utilised them to be obsolescent, because He made them an ethical vehicle such as they had never been before. He transformed and spiritualised thereby the existing eschatology: He rendered it one of hope rather than of fear, positive rather than negative. Only the time-process was needful to display for the progressive instruction of millions through many centuries the essential presentness and the real inwardness and so the permanence of His doctrine. In a word, the religious hope outlived the form in which it had to be presented: the Ethics were found to be separable from the Eschatology.

We see this process beginning within the period of the rise of the New Testament literature. It is evident in the changed outlook of the later Pauline Epistles, wherein the old apocalyptic machinery is already being partially discarded without shock; and especially in the Johannine presentation of the Lord's intimate teaching, wherein, but for a few (possibly separable) verses and phrases, the national and realistic eschatology is rejected, and the permanence of the revelation and its intrinsic universalism stand out as never before, and in a way perhaps never so appreciated as in our own time, when other lines of thought are converging toward similar teaching.

The purpose of God for us, in us and through us, by the working of His indwelling Spirit, apprehended and interpreted by means of the highest revelation that has ever been experienced in humanity, is a grander thing to seek to know and to make the lode-star of our earthly conduct than any curious or morbid interest in the manner of this world's disintegration, the end of the to us immeasurable universe, or even the ultimate issues of personal being.

The Christ-like life, the Spirit-guided life, harmony with the best, purest and loveliest that is in ourselves, in the light of the sufficient example and teaching of Jesus, is a nobler and more satisfying aim for each than a peering into divine mysteries outside our experience, necessarily unsuccessful and of little or no value for daily conduct.

Yet so well established is the eschatological reaction, so to speak, in human religious experience, that in times of stress or catastrophe, of pestilence or war, of gloom or oppression, the old apocalyptic hope and dread in some form or other break forth afresh, according as the craving for justice is awakened and the primitive emotion of fear liberated.

C. THE UTILITY OF ITS CONCRETE PRESENTATION

The whole question of the use and limitations of apocalyptic symbolism is very difficult and elusive, and too wide to be treated with any fulness here. But let us try to re-express the essentials of our Lord's doctrine as regards the future in a fresh manner, because of the form in which it was presented.

We must keep the Son-consciousness primary. Now, however this ultimate datum is defined in the metaphysical terminology of any given Christian epoch, the fact which the follower of Jesus assumes is this: that one human Personality who existed under the conditions of a definite period in human history and taught within a certain confined space on the surface of this earth, became conscious of perfect harmony of will with the Ultimate Spirit, conceived of, indeed, in terms of the Jewish religious symbolism of the age and named by Him predominantly "Father," but peculiarly His Father. And this title was expressive of our Lord's complete assurance as to the source and the continuity of the revelation given through Himself, nay, even of

its identity with the divine will for His human brethren.

In this Personality, humanity was free to attain perfectness of sonship, desirable for, if not consciously desired by, all; but it is believed that in this Personality also God came to perfect self-expression under the conditions and within the psychical and physical limitations of human existence. Jesus, the incarnate Son, the human being divine in character, the divine in terms of man, is the point, so to speak, of union for man and God; because conscious self-identification in character with the Christ is the only way of approach for others to the harmony of the human and the divine: and this is an inward activity, unfettered by the restrictions of humanly measured time.

This consciousness of harmony with God, of union with the Father's will, of the interaction of love, of inward peace and outward rectitude, however we strive to express it in words, was undoubtedly desired by Jesus for all, and set before them as their ideal.

But in what manner was this teaching of harmony to be conveyed in speech? He Himself as man was conditioned by the limitations of knowledge, of philosophical and psychological conceptions (as we should call them), by the restrictions of language, and so forth, which marked the time (in our spatial way of defining it) of His human life.

Therefore His teaching demands retranslation and restatement by us to suit the development of human

thought during the generations which have passed since the commencement of the Christian era.

But although the form in which the outlook of our Lord was enunciated is, as we have said, of relative value only because of the limited thought-world of His people, the content, on the other hand, from the world-wide experience of the intuitive response of men of different races, longitudes and centuries has proved itself to be permanently valid.

The aim being to bring the child of man into the fullest possible accord with the will of his heavenly Father, the necessary reaction had to be called forth in each individual who was capable of responding to the stimulus. But consciously or unconsciously the nature of the stimulus, which consisted both in the utterance of our Lord's words and also in the influence of what we should call His character, was itself conditioned by the circumstances of the appeal, local, mental and linguistic.

The modes of thought which obtained were of the concrete type, the rule of God, whether in the present or the future, was realistically conceived: the problem of good and evil, of human choice and human destiny, was stated or depicted to the mind as an incessant struggle of opposing spiritual yet quasi-material powers, with respective hierarchies of light and darkness, truth and falsehood, holiness and wickedness. This inherited dualism, combined with the influence of the monarchic story of the people in bygone days, compelled the

picture of the fellowship of filially disposed individuals to be set in the frame of the conception of the Kingdom of God which was already to hand.

Nevertheless, in the last resort it was the attitude of the individual and not of the nation or society which was central and essential, and the response in the associated acts of penitence and faith constituted the desired reaction, however time-conditioned by the terminology of current expectation the application of the inwardly effective stimulus might be. The Kingdom of God, the coming age, was generally envisaged concretely, crudely, sensuously, and for the most part from the view-point of the narrowest patriotism and partisanship.

In such circumstances of Jewish thought a purely abstract teaching of mystic union with God in filial relationship, and of a mystic society of similarly attuned souls, would have constituted an appeal that would have reached and produced the desired reaction in but few of the hearers of our Lord.

Granting the unconscious desire, not to say necessity, for a concrete embodiment of the ideal, to whom was our Lord to direct men for the model of sonship, the pattern of the Kingdom type, the standard, and therefore—by its very presence amongst them, if present—the measure of judgement for the fulfilment of this filial relationship, this at-one-ment of man and God which was ultimately the spiritual objective of His message? But *ipso facto* faith in the message involved faith in the Messenger. To whom then was He

virtually directing men unless to Himself—although this was unrealised till after the Resurrection, conscious as He was intuitively of complete identity of will, however and whenever such assurance was attained in the course of His human physical and mental development? This pointing of men to Himself as the incarnation of the human ideal is to be detected by implication in the synoptic records in teaching such as that expressed in His declaration of spiritual relationship to the doers of the Father's will (Mk 3³⁵ ||), in the confession of thankfulness, and—assuming it to have been spoken in His own name—in the royal invitation to those pining for spiritual settlement through inward change (Mt 11^{25ff.}). But it emerges explicitly in the spiritual and experimental interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, in statements such as: "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly" (10¹⁰), or "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but through me" (14⁶).

Herein lies the imperishable value of this writing, that with its sympathetic depth and intimate insight into the spirit of the Lord's teaching, it reveals the life-giving power beneath the older apocalyptic phrasing and renders the intrinsic extrinsic.

But in this connexion the consciousness of Jesus (albeit unexpressed in so many words) of bringing human nature to its ideal fulness, has a point of contact with the definite eschatological teaching.

For the Son of man cycle of ideas, variable and

still fluid as it appears to have been—once a human or Messianic personification, later a heavenly figure indeed, lay to His hand, and it was without the nationalistic and political limitations and associations of the Davidic king. With that personage of prophecy and apocalypse our Lord identified Himself in His own humble manifestation, whatever may have been the future prerogatives which He expected to exercise as ruler of the elect. Yet it was not as leader in war, avenger on foes, and Judge of persecutors and apostates that He pictured Himself, but rather—according to the stratum of tradition which is presumably the earliest—as future Witness to the filial spirit of His followers, their Companion, their Advocate in the divine Judgment, testifying to their likeness to Himself as dutiful children of the Father in heaven. This sonship quality, mediated through the incarnate manifestation of self-denying redemptive love, which reflected through His person and life-giving work the outgoing divine love, proved as time elapsed not to be limited to years or localities, although the thought of an imminent judgment, associated indissolubly with the earthly materialising of the divine dominion, was part and parcel of the mental furniture of the age.

The Son of man in humble earthly self-revelation was afterwards found to be the Pattern for mankind, and therefore, as the Fourth Gospel realised, not only Witness in some time to come to the like, but Judge inevitably in the present of the unlike.

Still when the local and temporary, the Oriental and concrete mode of presentation is eliminated, the Figure of sonship remains, and the representative value of the once apocalyptic title, the Son of man, emerges. The Pattern is permanent while humanity lasts; the son-relationship does not change, though civilisations alter and social conditions of life, intercourse and commerce vastly different obtain.

The Jewish apocalyptic figure of the Son of man abides for all time a symbol to mankind of the human ethical ideal, of the perfect spiritual relationship of man to God, of the fulness of spiritual life.

Whilst we assert with confidence that the inward impulse was what our Lord desired to set free by means of the divine appeal from without through Himself, in order that a man might be fit for the communion with God which was realised and set forth in His own filial trust and love, we must constantly remember that He belonged to and lived amongst a people who thought concretely, not to say with crudely realistic symbols, and in their ardent if narrow patriotism loved strong contrasts in eschatological colour.

The appeal to the majority then demanded to some extent at least the use of those speculative structures of the national imagination which served to give expression to their ethical estimate of those—whether of their own race or belonging to the nations—deserving of happiness or woe, in pictures of heavenly bliss for the righteous, and awful torment and doom for the ungodly.

Some such apocalyptic realism constitutes a lever which has been frequently utilised for the less intelligent who are unable to think abstractly or philosophically, but need powerful stimuli to right attitude and right conduct. Or to put it in another way. Although they would regard themselves such, as members of a "peculiar people," few of our Lord's auditory would really belong to the "once-born" type of religious experience. From His standpoint, that is, there would be few mystic souls intuitively responsive to His appeal for the active emergence of the filial relationship, because the apprehension of the very possibility of that relationship was not, to say the least, prevalent. The majority had to be "twice-born," they required spiritual re-birth, as the author of the Fourth Gospel realised and testified. And that demanded a violent awakening, a sense of impending catastrophe, a crisis such as the Baptist had preached. To such the change through penitence to son-consciousness which issued in self-fitting for the Kingdom and arose from the assurance of divine forgiveness, with the ethical power and transformed outlook which it involved, came with the suddenness of a lightning flash.

It is, moreover, a fact of considerable ethical value that in the speculations of apocalyptic imagination familiar to the contemporaries of our Lord the time-symbol predominated: the transformation—albeit national rather than individual—was coming soon. Later Midrashim exhibit the prominence of the space-

symbol, locating rather than dating, and the descriptions are of eschatological places rather than the calculating of a time-interval. The earlier teaching permitted more spiritual application and afforded a more urgent moral leverage. Such the synoptic records demonstrate that Jesus utilised, while He exhibited the foolishness of apocalyptic reckoning.

But He wasted no words on the delineating of future states, or on the depicting of localities of happiness or wretchedness with detailed material and sensuous imagery.

It is just the same with us moderns. There are, and probably always will be, especially in our more literalistic and matter-of-fact Western world, a number of people on the lower intellectual levels, to whom the appeal to the divine likeness in them, the God-related spirit within,—pressed, stifled, hemmed in, as it were, by adverse surroundings and unconscious individual inhibitions,—must come with the startling, convulsive power of a warning cry with its consequent emotional excitement, which will break through the covering of custom, convention or indifference, and bring about the sudden and lasting emergence of the highest and best—the divine, immanent but unrealised—in them.

But with us the use of the time-symbol is, as has been implied before, in terms of the endurance of the physical life, rather than as with the old apocalyptic writers on the basis of a calculation of the approaching national or world-judgement, or as with our Lord on the ground of the imminence of the Kingdom.

Instead of future bliss or woe being utilised as a means of alluring or repelling respectively, it is rather the inward gladness or misery, and the physical well-being or detriment which arise here and now as the result of opposite lines of conduct, good or bad, sympathetic or selfish; and these, experimentally verified and scientifically attested, we tend to project upon the future as a sure token of retribution for the individual.

Yet if this be rather the mode of appeal to the more cultured, the point is that the aim is identical with that of the ancient apocalyptic symbolism—the transforming apprehension through personal faith (self-surrender and self-opening to the divine inflow) of the fact of the blessedness of the filial and fraternal relationship possible for the man “in Christ,” according as the direction of life’s outlook is Godward or manward.

The joy of the ministering love disclosed in the final parable-scene is not one experienced in some future existence alone, but lies in the conscious in-working of the Spirit of Christ, His sacramental presence, which is felt day by day in the self-denial and service of love-impelled lives.

There is a Paradise of present experience, as St. Paul and the writer of the spiritual Gospel realised and expressed in diverse ways, which no sensuous imagery of a future state can increase, but which opens up to the human spirit a vista of the gladness of ministry and active love unlimited in scope.

There is a torture of present desolation, remorse

and self-condemnation which no gruesome details of materially delineated punishment can intensify, because the sense of the unutterable loss of divine and human communion is already to some extent apprehended.

D. THE PERMANENCE OF THE ETHICS

It must not be thought from what has been said that the conception of retribution as such represented in terms of a time-symbolism has no permanent value. It is the manner of that presentation which exhibits a limited horizon, local colour and special modes of expression, and these last are for the most part themselves inherited, traditional and already complex. The eschatological forms characteristic of earlier stages of human religious development persist, and, their original connexion having been lost, are strictly incongruous with later modes of thought. Just as with the individual the deeply impressed scenes of childhood continue to supply the setting in the dreams of much later life, and produce weird inconsistencies to the waking reason.

The permanent value is to be regarded as lying not in the appeal to the ineradicable primitive, indeed pre-human, emotion of terror, but in the fact that the approbation or otherwise of conduct by a man's fellows in a religious community or church is projected as it were on the screen of the future by the imagination, and, heightened and portrayed in material imagery by the ethical passion of prophet and teacher, becomes when utilised at its best (and we are not regarding the debase-

ment of the instrument of fear for lust of power or gain) a picture of the divine judgement applied to the individual as encouragement or warning, as the case may be, to be effectual in the ordering of present activities and habits ; in other words, to enable the individual from the detached and presumably divine standpoint to exercise self-judgement in the present.

The lasting worth then, we might say, lies in the ethical content of the idea and not in the special form of its presentation, in its meaning and not in its manner, and the spiritual and moral value of the special presentation of the truth of inevitable recompense may be said to vary inversely with the purely fear-emotion aroused thereby.

Just herein consists the ethical pre-eminence of the teaching of our Lord in His utilising of apocalyptic symbolism. He extracts the utmost out of the positive appeal, and makes the life of realised divine sonship, of potential and ideal citizenship and actual fellowship, central now, and renders thereby the animal, self-centred life by contrast conscious of present and eternal loss.

Eschatology has become in the Master's hands but a means to an end, a vehicle for the conveying of ethical and spiritual appeal, an instrument for the freeing of the best in man, for proclaiming the divinely born and divinely directed spirit-life of the faithful and forgiven to be the *summum bonum* for mankind.

Thus although, as we have stated before, the eschatological passages constitute only a portion of our Lord's

teaching, yet we find them to be charged with an inherent and transforming ethical significance, and that of permanent validity, even if the primary intention was self-fitting for acceptance in the speedily expected Kingdom in response to the invitation of divine grace through Himself. And the intrinsic principles have only required adaptation to the special needs of each age of social change and each phase of religious development in order to demonstrate their essentially permanent obligation.

At this stage we may well recall very briefly by way of illustration the various typical phases of individual conduct and endeavour which were found to be demanded from the would-be citizen who had ears to hear the call.

Penitence coupled with faith is the twofold preliminary condition. Then follow on the positive side, active seeking, singleness of aim, with child-likeness as the inward filial disposition, and forgiveness as the outwardly directed manifestation of love, corresponding with that experienced within from God. Moreover, labour in devoted service is desired from each would-be member, combined with constant preparedness for the advent of the divine Householder. And withal that qualification which is assumed throughout rather than frequently emphasised — prayerfulness, the communing of the human child in spirit with the heavenly Father to attain identity of will and gain strength for the fulfilling thereof.

On the negative side, voluntary self-denial is the pre-eminent essential, and the inevitable suffering arising

from persecution for the life of higher righteousness is what each follower of the Master has to expect. Further, the new life which Jesus demanded consisted just in the personal exercise of such qualities as these in lieu of mere legal punctiliousness and crowded observances, while the Jews' customary threefold duty of almsgiving, prayer and fasting was transmuted with a new inwardness. Again, the individual sphere of religious obligation is extended by the emphasis on the wider love, the mutual ministering which is to be practised without national or class distinction towards man as such. Finally, the chief hindrance to the life of sonship and spiritual preparation apart from a crippling legalism seems in our Lord's estimation to have consisted in the possession of wealth, which tended to be an end and not a means alone.

Now all these things only need re-application to suit seasons of intellectual advance and changes in human organisation, although it has to be admitted that the qualities and habits deemed essential for the recipient of the divine boon of the Kingdom were all spoken of in connexion with the immediate expectation of that outwardly to be established rule of God. And not only so, some or indeed most of them are found to recur in other so-called eschatological contexts relating to Life, to the coming of the Son of man, and also to the Judgement, whether in direct or parabolic treatment.

But the profoundly important fact is that none of them are found to be really dependent on that special

time-conditioned outlook ; but when separated therefrom possess a perpetual validity for the realisation of man's best self, for liberating through active self-sacrifice his sonship, the divinest in him ; and they can each and all to-day be applied to the training of the individual life for the approach of the self-surrendered soul in and through the requirements and activities of human fellowship towards a communion with God, the full fruition of which is unattainable during earthly experience.

Herein consists the uniqueness of the revelation. Take away the eschatological husk, the phrasing of Jewish apocalyptic symbolism with which the teaching is so intimately associated, and the kernel of it, the heart of practical religion, the sonship ideal for man, remains unimpaired. The magnificent hope is undiminished, nay rather it is enhanced, enlarged and universalised, and only the manner of its expression undergoes change in accordance with the progressive divine education of our race and the pressing needs of the Church.

E. THE WORTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The ancient eschatological expectation has passed away, but the principles which Jesus enshrined therein abide. That neglected aspect of religion upon which our Lord laid such insistent stress, individual piety—the apprehension and realisation of spiritual sonship, or in other words personal responsibility, is brought out as powerfully or even more so when the objective of perfected life is realised as being something not future

only but continuous, and progressively attainable in the relative manner that is possible amidst mundane limitations.

It is here and now that the twofold individual responsibility finds scope for its exercise and fulfilment: towards God in the religious life of worship and devotion; towards man in the daily display of those qualities, dispositions and activities, religious and social, which were found to befit those who would inherit the Kingdom, whose ultimate aim—however temporarily symbolised—is communion with God.

This relationship with the Father and with the brethren is entered upon now: whether as in our Lord's day a speedy manifestation of heavenly dominion was looked for, or as in our own a slow evolution, a gradual progress of the individual (and of humanity at large) towards harmony with the divine will, and towards unity one with another in religious and social peace, because of the unrest in thought which betokens a universal spiritual awakening, and because of the increasingly apprehended truth of the solidarity of mankind as potential sons of God, sharers in an ultimate and creative spiritual life.

Such personal responsibility comes to include in our time as part of the function of religion, consecrated effort for the betterment of conditions in all grades and phases of human life and labour, by reason of our more widespread and progressive understanding of the intimate co-ordination of matter and mind, body and

spirit, and because of our growing appreciation of the fact that material comfort alone is insufficient for man's satisfaction, and is only a means to an end. Herein lies the religious basis for idealistic socialism and for discriminating philanthropy; although to expect perfect conditions on earth for masses or for individuals is an empty dream.

In the view of our Lord's contemporaries, the social conditions and relationships then obtaining were to be overthrown by the catastrophic conclusion of the old and the emergence of the new age; but for us to whom organised human civilisation is relatively speaking permanent, the social ideal, because of the teaching of Jesus concerning the holy community and its members, has become a part of the religious ideal to which it is our duty one and all as His followers to approximate as far as we can, and to mould existing conditions thereby in the circumstances of human life on earth; while we leave the "how" and the "when" of the realisation of the ideal of the holy society, the perfect brotherhood, to the Father in whom we repose our trust as sons in Christ by conscious self-identification with Him.

The worth of human personality in view of the coming Kingdom and the Judgement was related by Jesus with the continuous interaction—ethically conditioned on the basis of divine love—between the one and the many, man and his fellows, in perpetual striving for the glorious cause of the community that was to be.

With our altered world-view the value of the individual is by no means minimised because the uncertain time-limit for his salvation, so to speak, is the physical change which we term death, instead of the sudden in-breaking of the new age. The fundamental conditions of free surrender to the highest in us and of love in exercise towards God and man are unaffected; they are independent of the special local and temporary apocalyptic mode of presentation of the end for all and for each, in the first or any succeeding Christian generation.

The historic proclamation, summons or invitation of Jesus, however it may be termed, remains always the touchstone of personal decision, the stimulus for change of mind or conversion—whatever be the manner thereof, and thus the constantly present standard of judgement for those who have had the opportunity of receiving it.

For such as have not been enabled to attain to the knowledge of the revelation in Christ we can assert nothing; but a faith modelled on the unwavering certainty of the Son-consciousness of our Lord—that inward life which gave the universal momentum to His personality—renders us fully assured that divine Fatherly mercy and justice will find perfect reconciliation in relation to all humanity, to speak only of the noblest of created beings with which we are acquainted upon our own planet.

We should do well to remember, leaders of thought

and humble learners, clergy and laity alike, in our various churches and in our greatly differentiated and highly complex modern organisation, civic and economic, social and commercial, that no expression of the fundamental truths of the revelation through Jesus Christ has ever been free—whether with regard to the outlook on the future therein exhibited, or in any other domain of human thought which it affected—from the current religious conceptions, the limitations of knowledge, the symbolism, imagery and metaphor, which marked the people and era of its utterance; nor ever can be free from them, terrestrial conditions abiding the same.

The impress of each epoch is upon its thought-forms, the expression of its hopes, the definition of its doctrines, whether in respect of the universe or of the individual; and we cannot escape the fact that it is incumbent upon us also in our turn to endeavour to transmute, interpret and re-express, according to the light of our own time, that special portion of the Gospel upon which our scrutiny has been engaged in this work—the outlook of Jesus.

Because of the progress of mankind in wider religion, in vaster accumulation of knowledge, in the gradual if tedious breaking down of social and national barriers, and other signs of ethical advance, we apprehend that in the reinterpreting and adapting for our own age, conditions and needs of this prominent factor in the teaching of the Master, we shall ultimately not lose

aught, but entirely and greatly gain. In the religion which attaches to the Person of Jesus, and sprang from His doctrine, there is illimitable hope for humanity.

And our faith stands secure—for all self-surrendered souls at least—that the revelation of God in Christ teaches us that behind all the perplexities of our earthly existence is ultimately Love.

And this is verified by individual experience through following the way of Love which was exemplified perfectly in the incarnate life; in the realisation of the truth of Love testified by universal order and slowly apprehended by successive generations; and in setting before ourselves the goal of perfect communion, the life of Love, which, once clearly envisaged, kindles deep gratitude born of divine forgiveness in the devoted filial spirit, and reveals to each in turn how, stimulated by its transcendent hope, even on this present plane of existence—

“something ere the end,
Some work of noble note, may yet be done.”

ROVER R

NEW TESTAMENT405

MATTHEW—continued.

	PAGE
9 ¹³	111
9 ^{22ff.}	190
9 ³⁴	191
9 ³⁵	15
10	197
10 ^{1ff.}	138
10 ^{5ff.}	139
10 ^{5ff.}	63
10 ⁶	265
10 ^{6ff.}	19
10 ¹⁵	257 ff., 275
10 ^{17ff.}	206
10 ¹⁸	138
10 ²³	138, 265
10 ^{24ff.}	139
10 ^{26ff.}	75, 270
10 ²⁸	124, 271, 278
10 ^{29ff.}	261
10 ³²	191
10 ^{32ff.}	101, 122 f., 154, 162
10 ³³	292
10 ³⁴	111
10 ³⁹	279
10 ⁴⁰	56, 257
10 ^{40ff.}	232
10 ⁴¹	233
10 ⁴²	232
11 ^{1ff.}	197
11 ³	15, 62
11 ⁵	14
11 ⁶	71
11 ^{7ff.}	45
11 ¹¹	45
11 ^{11ff.}	47
11 ¹²	46
11 ^{12ff.}	22
11 ¹⁹	170
11 ²⁰	258
11 ^{21ff.}	87, 257
11 ²²	259
11 ²³	275
11 ²⁴	258 f.
11 ^{25ff.}	198, 389
11 ²⁷	43, 199
11 ^{28ff.}	198
11 ²⁹	83
12 ⁸	185
12 ²²	189
12 ²⁴	191
12 ²⁵	61, 190

MATTHEW—continued.

	PAGE
12 ²⁷	190
12 ²⁸	62, 190
12 ^{30f.}	190
12 ^{31f.}	190
12 ³²	192
12 ³⁴	265
12 ^{34ff.}	260
12 ³⁶	259
12 ^{36ff.}	260, 273, 315
12 ³⁸	172
12 ⁴⁰	173
12 ⁴¹	259
12 ⁴²	173
12 ⁵⁰	53
13	150
13 ^{11ff.}	74
13 ^{16ff.}	43, 72, 199
13 ¹⁹	23, 87
13 ^{24ff.}	79
13 ³⁰	283
13 ³¹	69, 77
13 ³³	69, 77
13 ³⁷	151
13 ^{37ff.}	150
13 ³⁸	54, 87, 273
13 ^{40ff.}	150
13 ⁴¹	37, 54, 151, 162, 261, 291, 313
13 ⁴²	281, 283, 288
13 ⁴³	54, 89, 244
13 ⁴⁴	81
13 ^{45ff.}	81
13 ⁴⁷	79
13 ^{47ff.}	152
13 ⁵⁰	281, 283, 288
13 ^{51ff.}	87
13 ⁵²	75
14 ¹⁴	17
15 ²⁴	111, 140
15 ³²	99 n.
16 ¹	172
16 ⁴	172
16 ¹³	177
16 ¹⁸	277
16 ¹⁹	55, 67
16 ²¹	98, 217
16 ²⁵	88, 279
16 ²⁷	122, 153, 261
16 ²⁸	28, 39
17 ⁹	143, 217
17 ^{11ff.}	103

MATTHEW—continued.

	PAGE
17 ^{22f.}	104
17 ²³	217
18 ^{1ff.}	43, 57
18 ³	83
18 ^{8ff.}	41, 224, 268 f.
18 ⁹	272
18 ¹⁰	58, 245
18 ¹¹	137
18 ¹²	273
18 ^{12ff.}	278
18 ¹⁴	278
18 ^{21ff.}	90
18 ^{23ff.}	82, 91
18 ³⁵	91
19 ^{1ff.}	40
19 ¹²	24, 86, 88
19 ^{13ff.}	43
19 ¹⁴	57, 83
19 ¹⁶	40
19 ^{16ff.}	220
19 ¹⁷	221
19 ²¹	221
19 ²³	40
19 ^{23ff.}	84
19 ²⁷	155
19 ²⁸	23, 110, 141, 155, 157, 263, 334
19 ²⁹	23, 222
19 ³⁰	83
20 ^{1ff.}	79, 237
20 ¹⁹	107, 116 f.
20 ²¹	37
20 ²⁸	86, 109, 244
21 ⁹	39
21 ¹⁶	197
21 ³¹	58, 87
21 ⁴¹	64 f.
21 ⁴³	64
22 ^{1ff.}	286
22 ^{2ff.}	79
22 ^{8ff.}	286
22 ^{11ff.}	82, 286
22 ¹³	286, 288
22 ^{30ff.}	210
22 ^{34ff.}	43
23 ⁶	254
23 ¹¹	56
23 ^{11ff.}	65, 110
23 ¹²	83
23 ¹³	55, 65
23 ^{13ff.}	254

INDEX OF REFERENCES

407

MATTHEW—continued.

	PAGE
23 ¹⁵	273
23 ²³	88
23 ³³	265, 274
23 ^{35f.}	32
23 ³⁶	266
23 ^{37ff.}	32, 266
24 ³	39, 148, 156
24 ¹⁴	15, 24, 140
24 ^{17f.}	147
24 ²³	146
24 ^{26f.}	146
24 ³⁰	125, 156
24 ³⁴	157
24 ^{34f.}	195
24 ³⁶	195
24 ³⁷	147
24 ³⁹	147
24 ⁴⁰	157
24 ^{40f.}	147
24 ⁴²	133
24 ^{43ff.}	164
24 ⁴⁴	133
24 ^{45ff.}	133, 166
24 ⁴⁶	72
24 ⁵¹	164, 288
25	213
25 ^{1ff.}	82, 134
25 ⁵	166
25 ¹⁰	291
25 ¹³	164
25 ^{14ff.}	80, 163
25 ²¹	72, 242
25 ²³	242
25 ³⁰	164, 287 f.
25 ³¹	153, 157
25 ³²	310
25 ³⁴	59, 284
25 ³⁵	261
25 ^{35ff.}	82, 91
25 ⁴¹	269, 281, 284
25 ⁴⁶	226, 269, 281, 284
26 ²	117
26 ^{11f.}	109
26 ¹²	65
26 ³⁴	292
26 ^{24f.}	113
26 ^{26ff.}	116
26 ²⁹	29
26 ³²	217
26 ⁴⁵	114, 117

MATTHEW—continued.

	PAGE
26 ⁴⁶	114
26 ⁵⁰	180
26 ⁶¹	99 n.
26 ^{64f.}	129
27 ⁵⁷	44
28 ⁷	143
28 ¹⁹	25, 140

MARK.

1 ¹	323
1 ⁴	12
1 ¹⁰	200
1 ¹¹	202
1 ^{14f.}	13
1 ¹⁵	87
1 ²⁴	277
1 ^{38f.}	16
2 ⁵	91
2 ¹⁰	182
2 ¹²	182
2 ^{19f.}	67, 109, 164
2 ²⁰	256
2 ²⁷	186 f.
2 ^{27f.}	185
3 ^{14ff.}	20
3 ²¹	188
3 ^{23ff.}	188
3 ²⁴	61
3 ^{28f.}	188
3 ³⁵	389
4 ^{11f.}	74, 76
4 ¹⁴	23
4 ¹⁶	242
4 ²²	75
4 ²⁴	255
4 ^{26ff.}	69, 78, 150 f.
4 ³⁰	69, 77
6 ⁵	88
6 ^{7ff.}	19
6 ¹²	87
6 ^{12f.}	19
6 ³⁴	17
7 ^{21ff.}	36
7 ²⁷	140
8 ²	99 n.
8 ¹²	172
8 ²⁹	97
8 ³¹	142, 146, 218
8 ^{31f.}	98
8 ³⁵	88, 246, 271, 279

MARK—continued.

	PAGE
8 ³⁸	101, 121, 131, 153, 160, 292
9 ¹	28, 101, 141
9 ^{2ff.}	101
9 ⁷	337
9 ¹¹	101
9 ^{11ff.}	28
9 ^{12f.}	102
9 ³¹	142
9 ^{31f.}	104
9 ^{33f.}	56
9 ³⁵	92
9 ^{38ff.}	58
9 ^{41f.}	232
9 ⁴³	223, 268 f., 282
9 ⁴⁵	223, 268 f.
9 ⁴⁷	42, 223, 268 f.
9 ⁴⁸	282
10 ^{1ff.}	40
10 ^{2ff.}	24
10 ^{14f.}	83
10 ¹⁵	42, 57
10 ¹⁷	40, 220
10 ^{17ff.}	226
10 ²¹	88, 221, 238
10 ²³	40, 222
10 ^{23ff.}	84, 155
10 ²⁴	222
10 ^{24f.}	41
10 ²⁵	222
10 ²⁶	222, 245
10 ^{29f.}	23, 88
10 ³⁰	156, 222
10 ^{32ff.}	106
10 ^{33f.}	114
10 ³⁴	142
10 ³⁵	56
10 ^{35ff.}	88
10 ³⁷	37, 56, 243
10 ^{37ff.}	86, 263
10 ⁴⁰	92
10 ^{43ff.}	92
10 ⁴⁴	56
10 ⁴⁵	86, 109, 137, 244
11 ¹⁰	39
11 ²⁵	90
12 ^{1ff.}	111, 164
12 ²⁵	223
12 ^{25ff.}	210
12 ^{28ff.}	226
12 ^{30ff.}	90

INDEX OF REFERENCES

409

LUKE—continued.		LUKE—continued.		LUKE—continued.	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
13 ²⁴	47, 85, 225, 280, 289	17 ³⁰	147, 158	23 ⁴²	36
13 ^{24f.}	256	17 ³¹	206, 256	23 ⁴³	249, 271, 276
13 ^{24ff.}	81, 161, 286	17 ^{31ff.}	147	23 ⁵¹	44
13 ²⁶	160, 256, 290	17 ³³	88, 279	23 ^{6f.}	116
13 ^{26f.}	53, 313	18 ^{6ff.}	135	24 ⁷	107
13 ²⁷	53, 256, 291	18 ⁸	135	24 ²¹	67
13 ²⁸	286, 289	18 ¹⁴	66	24 ^{25ff.}	107
13 ^{28f.}	48, 161 f., 290	18 ^{16f.}	83	24 ⁴⁶	218
13 ^{28ff.}	88	18 ¹⁷	42	24 ⁴⁷	87
13 ³¹	266	18 ¹⁸	40, 220		
13 ³²	99 n.	18 ²²	221		
13 ³³	105	18 ²⁴	40		
13 ^{33ff.}	32	18 ^{24f.}	84		
13 ^{34f.}	266	18 ^{28f.}	155		
14 ¹¹	66	18 ²⁹	23, 34		
14 ^{13f.}	236	18 ^{29f.}	262		
14 ¹⁴	213	18 ³⁰	222		
14 ¹⁵	49, 243, 292	18 ^{31f.}	107		
14 ^{15ff.}	287	18 ³⁴	108		
14 ^{16ff.}	79	19 ^{9f.}	244		
14 ^{22f.}	80	19 ¹⁰	110, 137		
14 ²⁴	82, 292	19 ¹¹	49, 166		
15 ⁷	88, 242	19 ^{12ff.}	80, 163, 242		
15 ¹⁰	88, 242	19 ²²	261		
15 ¹⁷	242	19 ³⁸	39, 157		
15 ²⁴	242	19 ^{41ff.}	33		
15 ³²	88, 242	20 ^{17f.}	64		
16 ⁴	247	20 ^{34ff.}	210, 212		
16 ⁸	216	20 ³⁵	89, 159, 215		
16 ⁹	247, 348	20 ³⁶	216		
16 ¹⁶	22, 45, 47, 63	20 ³⁸	212, 310		
16 ¹⁷	51	20 ^{45ff.}	254		
16 ²²	238	21 ²⁷	125		
16 ²³	248, 251, 276	21 ²⁸	31, 126		
16 ^{23f.}	281 f.	21 ^{29ff.}	126		
16 ^{30f.}	88	21 ^{31f.}	31		
17 ²	58	21 ^{32f.}	195		
17 ^{3f.}	90	21 ³⁴	31		
17 ¹⁰	237	21 ^{34ff.}	195		
17 ²⁰	50	21 ³⁶	159		
17 ^{20f.}	144 f.	22 ¹⁶	29		
17 ^{20ff.}	35	22 ¹⁸	29		
17 ²¹	67, 333	22 ²²	136		
17 ²²	158	22 ^{22ff.}	113		
17 ^{22f.}	144	22 ²⁷	110		
17 ²³	206 f.	22 ²⁸	89		
17 ²⁴	146, 158	22 ^{28ff.}	110, 155		
17 ²⁵	116, 146	22 ^{29f.}	37, 54, 263		
17 ²⁶	147, 158	22 ³⁰	141, 243		
17 ^{26ff.}	133	22 ^{46ff.}	115		
		22 ^{67ff.}	130		

JOHN.

1 ¹⁴	341
1 ⁵¹	341
2 ¹⁹	99 n., 130
3 ³	333
3 ⁵	333
3 ^{13f.}	342
3 ^{13ff.}	336
3 ¹⁶	351
3 ¹⁷	349
3 ¹⁸	350
3 ¹⁹	349 f.
3 ³⁶	346
4 ¹⁴	345
4 ³⁶	346
5 ²¹	217, 345 f., 347
5 ²²	349
5 ²⁴	347, 350 f.
5 ²⁵	346
5 ²⁶	345
5 ²⁷	339
5 ^{28f.}	339, 340, 350
5 ²⁹	345, 349
5 ⁴⁰	345
6 ²⁷	342
6 ³³	345
6 ³⁵	343, 345
6 ³⁹	351
6 ^{39f.}	340, 347
6 ^{39ff.}	348 f.
6 ⁴⁴	340, 347
6 ⁴⁸	345
6 ⁵⁰	351
6 ⁵¹	345, 351
6 ⁵³	343
6 ⁵⁴	340, 347
6 ⁵⁷	345 f.
6 ⁶²	342
6 ⁶³	345
8 ¹²	345

APOCRYPHA, PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, ETC.

TOBIT.		ENOCH— <i>continued.</i>		ENOCH— <i>continued.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
4 ^{8f.}	240	47 ⁴	32, 214, 242	92 ¹	292
14 ¹⁰	288	48 ^{2f.}	59	92 ³	214
JUDITH.		48 ⁷	137, 245	98 ³	284
16 ¹⁷		48 ⁹	243, 272	99 ¹¹	271
WISDOM.		51 ¹	280	100 ⁵	214
2 ²²		51 ^{1f.}	214	103 ^{3f.}	214
3 ^{1ff.}		51 ²	245	103 ^{7f.}	276
9 ⁴		51 ⁴	242	103 ⁸	288
SIRACH.		52 ⁴	34	104 ^{1ff.}	238
5 ¹³		54 ¹	283	104 ⁴	212, 242
7 ¹⁷		54 ^{1ff.}	272	104 ⁶	212
29 ¹¹		54 ⁶	283 f.	106 ¹⁵	281
2 MACCABEES.		55 ⁴	155	106 ¹⁷	281
7 ⁹		58 ³	227	108 ³	271
7 ¹⁴		60 ⁸	250	108 ^{3ff.}	289
7 ⁸⁶		60 ²³	250	108 ¹¹	216, 247
12 ⁴³		61 ⁵	214	108 ¹²	263
ENOCH.		61 ⁸	216, 262	108 ¹⁴	258
1-36		61 ¹²	250	PSALMS OF SOLOMON.	
10 ^{4ff.}		62	91	3 ¹²	214
10 ^{12ff.}		62 ²	129	3 ¹⁶	227
15 ⁷		62 ^{2ff.}	151	9 ⁹	229, 240
16 ¹		62 ³	122, 155, 158 f.	13 ⁹	227
18 ¹¹		62 ⁵	122, 155, 158	13 ¹¹	214
19 ¹		62 ⁶	34	14 ³	214
21 ^{7ff.}		62 ⁸	159, 212, 214,	14 ⁶	228, 288
22		62 ^{11ff.}	245	15 ^{10ff.}	250
22 ¹¹		62 ¹³	137, 245	15 ¹¹	288
25 ⁴		62 ^{13ff.}	212	15 ^{11ff.}	280
37 ⁴		62 ¹⁴	227	15 ¹⁵	228
38 ²		62 ^{15f.}	244	APOCALYPSE OF EZRA	
39 ⁴		63 ⁶	258	(2 ESDRAS).	
39 ^{7f.}		63 ⁹	153	4 ⁷	277
40 ⁵		63 ¹⁰	247, 283	4 ¹²	292
40 ⁹		63 ¹¹	157	4 ^{32ff.}	215
41 ²		67 ⁷	284	4 ³⁵	215, 248 f.
41 ⁹		67 ¹³	284	4 ³⁶	215
45 ²		69 ^{4f.}	216	4 ⁴¹	249
45 ³		69 ²⁷	151, 157	5 ⁹	133
46 ⁶		69 ²⁹	121	6 ²⁴	133
47 ²		70 ^{3f.}	250	6 ²⁵	245
		71 ⁵	251	7 ¹⁵	263
		71 ¹⁶	247	7 ³²	249
		77 ³	250	7 ³⁵	251, 259, 281 ff.
		80 ⁸	281	7 ⁴⁷	246
		84 ³	292	7 ^{51f.}	246
		90 ^{21ff.}	284		
		91 ¹⁰	214		

APOCALYPSE OF EZRA
—continued.

	PAGE
7 ^{59ff.} . . .	246
7 ^{60f.} . . .	243
7 ⁷³ . . .	259
7 ^{75ff.} . . .	249
7 ⁷⁷ . . .	240
7 ⁸⁰ . . .	276
7 ⁸⁴ . . .	281
7 ⁸⁷ . . .	281
7 ⁹³ . . .	243
7 ⁹⁷ . . .	244
7 ¹⁰⁵ . . .	276
7 ¹²³ . . .	251
7 ¹²⁵ . . .	288
7 ¹²⁹ . . .	229
7 ¹³⁷ . . .	228
8 ^{1ff.} . . .	246
8 ⁶ . . .	228
8 ³³ . . .	233, 240
8 ³⁶ . . .	237, 240
8 ³⁹ . . .	237
8 ⁵² . . .	251
8 ⁵⁴ . . .	240
8 ⁵⁹ . . .	281, 283
9 ¹⁵ . . .	246
10 ¹ . . .	68
10 ⁴ . . .	68
13 ^{25f.} . . .	263
13 ²⁶ . . .	59
13 ^{33ff.} . . .	157
13 ³⁸ . . .	151
13 ^{39f.} . . .	154
13 ⁵² . . .	146
13 ⁵⁶ . . .	233
14 ²² . . .	228

APOCALYPSE OF
BARUCH.

10 ⁶ . . .	292
14 ¹² . . .	240
19 ¹ . . .	229
21 ¹¹ . . .	246
21 ²³ . . .	248
24 ¹ . . .	240
30 ¹ . . .	214
30 ² . . .	249
30 ^{4f.} . . .	278

APOCALYPSE OF
BARUCH—continued.

	PAGE
32 ⁶ . . .	263
42 ⁷ . . .	214, 229, 280
44 ⁷ . . .	44
44 ¹⁵ . . .	281
49 . . .	214
51 ¹⁰ . . .	212, 244
57 ² . . .	263
76 ⁵ . . .	228
85 ¹² . . .	281
85 ¹³ . . .	229

(GREEK.)

4 ⁴ . . .	274
5 ² . . .	274
11 . . .	67, 240
15 . . .	233, 243

TEST. XII PATRI-
ARCHS.

Sim 67 . . .	214
Levi 3 ² . . .	284
13 ⁵ . . .	241
Jud 25 ¹ . . .	214
25 ³ . . .	284
25 ⁴ . . .	214
25 ¹¹ . . .	263
Zeb 10 ^{2f.} . . .	214
10 ³ . . .	280
Dan 2 . . .	232
Ash 6 ^{4f.} . . .	276
Jos 1 ⁶ . . .	91
Benj 10 ⁶ . . .	226
10 ^{6ff.} . . .	214

SLAVONIC ENOCH.

7 . . .	289
8f. . . .	251
10 . . .	284
10 ² . . .	288
30 ¹⁵ . . .	229
31 ² . . .	251
40 ¹² . . .	289
40 ^{12f.} . . .	281
41 ² . . .	292
42 ¹ . . .	55
42 ² . . .	249, 281

SLAVONIC ENOCH—
continued.

	PAGE
42 ^{3ff.} . . .	251
48 ⁹ . . .	246
50 ² . . .	228
53 ¹ . . .	249
55 ² . . .	248
60 ⁴ . . .	281
61 ^{2f.} . . .	248
65 ⁸ . . .	214, 246
65 ⁹ . . .	248
66 ⁷ . . .	214, 246

4 MACCABEES.

7 ¹⁹ . . .	212
10 ²⁵ . . .	212

JUBILEES.

15 ³¹ . . .	280
19 ²⁵ . . .	212
23 ²⁹ . . .	228
23 ³¹ . . .	238
36 ¹⁰ . . .	284

SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

3 ⁷³ . . .	284
3 ⁴⁵⁸ . . .	274
3 ⁶⁹⁰ . . .	284
4 ⁴³ . . .	288
5 ¹⁷³ . . .	274

TEST. ABRAHAM.

13 . . .	212
----------	-----

ASC. MOSES.

10 ⁹ . . .	212, 244
-----------------------	----------

ASC. ISAIAH.

4 ¹⁸ . . .	278
-----------------------	-----

DIDACHE.

10 . . .	39
16 ⁶ . . .	125
16 ⁷ . . .	215

ODES OF SOLOMON.

3, 8, etc. . .	334
----------------	-----

RABBINICAL AND OTHER LITERATURE

MISHNAH, ETC.		MISHNAH, ETC.—continued.	
	PAGE		PAGE
Sanhedrin 11 ¹	228	Bab. Kethuboth 111 ^b	228
Aboth 1 ⁸	238	„ Sotah 3 ^b	262
1 ⁵	226	„ Baba Bathra 11 ^a	241
1 ¹⁷	261	„ Menachoth 100 ^a	285
5 ¹⁹	226	Bereshith Rabbah 9	241
6 ⁹	262	32	288
Bab. Berakoth 17 ^a	217, 292	Shemoth Rabbah 14	288
28 ^b	250	Wayyikra „ 27	288
57 ^a	273	Kohethe „ on 4 ^b	289
58 ^b	215	Pesikta „ 1	228
61 ^a	266	Tos. Berak. 6 f.	285
61 ^b	226		
Bab. Sabbath 31 ^b	241		
33 ^a	261		
118 ^a	266		
152 ^b	252		
Bab. Erubin 19 ^a	285		
54 ^a	251		
Bab. Chagigah 14 ^a	158		
„ Rosh ha Shanah 16 ^b	215,		
	272, 278		
17 ^a	272 f., 278		
Bab. Sukkah 52 ^{a, b}	112		

AVESTA.

Yasna 27	160
33	262
43	238
45	160
62	244
Yast 12	244
19	244, 263
22	238, 244, 276, 287
Vendidad 7	238, 262

MODERN

Grenfell and Hunt, <i>Oxyrh. Papp.</i> , pt. iv.	66, 333
<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> , xii. 45	206
Schweitzer, <i>St. Paul</i> , 202	347 n.
Singer, <i>Daily Prayer Book</i> , 75 ff.	33
Volz, <i>Jüdische Eschatologie</i> , 237 ff.	220
„ „ „ 270 ff.	280
Wünsche, <i>Aus Israels Lehrhallen</i> , iii. 23 ff.	243
„ „ „ 54	55
„ „ „ 82	288
„ „ „ 103 ff.	112
„ „ „ 194	261
„ „ „ 236	55

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Beatitudes, 71, 84, 89, 168, 236.
 Blasphemy, 129, 185, 188 ff.
 Blessed, future of—
 Abraham's bosom, 248 f., 276.
 Eternal tabernacles, 246 ff., 348.
 Joy, 72, 212, 226, 241 ff., 292.
 Paradise, 124, 248 ff., 271, 276.
 Reward, 22, 156, 231 ff., 371 f.
 Salvation, 136 f., 244 ff., 349.
 Treasure, 221, 238 ff.
 Church, the, 15, 25, 35, 54, 60, 65,
 75, 80, 96, 160, 167, 199,
 208, 258, 277, 330 f., 381 f.
 Condemned, future of—
 Darkness, 285 ff.
 Destruction (Perishing), 88, 229,
 243, 277 ff., 316, 326, 378.
 Fire, 281 ff.
 Gehenna, 124, 207, 224, 229,
 251, 261, 265 f., 268 ff., 316.
 Hades, 271, 274 ff.
 Punishment (Suffering), 226 f.,
 280 f., 316, 378.
 Weeping, etc., 288 f.
 Confession (Denial) of Son of man,
 121 ff., 154, 160, 162, 191,
 235, 271, 292, 314.
 Day(s) of Son of man, 115, 144 ff.,
 158, 163, 340.
 Death, 350 f.
 Eucharist, 340 ff.
 Fear, 296, 322, 375, 377, 379, 383,
 395 f.
 Inwardness, 35 f., 44, 67, 145, 333 ff.,
 383.
 Jerusalem, fate of, 31 f., 207, 256,
 266, 319.
 Jesus—
 Baptism of, 198, 200 ff., 295 f.,
 341.
 Betrayal of, 105, 112 ff., 117 f.,
 179 f.
 Death of, 26, 103 ff., 111, 118,
 120, 143, 173, 218, 303.
 Functions of, 149, 301 ff.
 as Judge, 8, 124, 149 ff., 263 f.,
 305, 312, 326 ff., 339, 375 f.,
 390.
 as Witness, 124, 154, 292,
 306, 312, 390.
 Person of, 386 ff., 404.
 Resurrection of, 26, 44, 76, 94,
 104, 113 f., 116, 130, 138,
 142 f., 168, 217 ff., 303, 323,
 327.
 Return of, 46, 75, 148, 152, 164 f.,
 167, 323 ff., 362 f., 365 f., 381.
 Son-consciousness of, 93, 95, 120,
 148, 184, 187, 194 ff., 211,
 243, 295 f., 302, 317 f., 337,
 383, 385, 402.
 Temptation of, 100, 203, 296,
 304.
 Transfiguration of, 27 f., 101 f.,
 106, 142, 202, 217.
 Trial of, 127, 131, 301, 363.
 Triumphal Entry of, 33, 39, 157,
 218.
 John the Baptist, 11 ff., 22, 25 f., 32,
 45 ff., 62 ff., 71, 77, 87, 102 f.,
 170 f., 201, 265, 274, 285,
 296, 312, 341, 392.
 Jonah, sign of, 172 ff., 185, 259.
 Judgement, 5 f., 53, 253 ff., 311 ff.,
 322, 348 ff., 373 ff.

Kingdom of God, 6, 10 ff., 332 ff., 356 ff.
 Marks of—
 Development, 69 f., 77 f.
 Likeness, 76 ff.
 Mixture, 74, 78 ff.
 Value, 80 f.
 Qualifications for—
 Childlikeness, 42 f., 56 ff., 83, 397.
 Effort, 85, 397.
 Endurance, 89.
 Faith, 87 f., 343, 347, 352, 394, 397.
 Forgiveness, 82, 90 f., 182 ff., 188 ff., 268, 397.
 Higher righteousness, 86 ff., 234, 239, 372, 398.
 Humility, 83, 92.
 Love, 89 ff., 235 f., 268, 376, 379, 394, 402, 404.
 Ministering, 82, 91 ff., 108 ff., 113, 137, 213, 398.
 Readiness, 82, 132, 134, 161, 291, 397.
 Repentance, 12 ff., 19, 66, 87 f., 388, 397.
 Self-denial, 86, 88, 98, 397.
 Understanding, 86 f.
 Watchfulness, 30, 50, 133 f., 158, 164, 195.
 Signs of, 297.
 Subjects of, 6, 297 ff.
 and the Church, 24, 39, 46, 51, 64, 67, 152, 357 ff.
 and Life, 41, 58, 221 ff., 239, 335, 368.
 Last Supper, 110, 113, 155, 262, 292.
 Life, 6, 220 ff., 332, 344 ff., 366 ff.
 Little Apocalypse, 24, 30, 124 ff., 156, 195, 205 ff., 245.
 Messiah, 28, 34, 40 *et passim*.
 Messiahship, 27, 39, 63, 97, 129, 131, 201 ff., 290, 302 f., 383.
 Messianic age, 14, 72, 297.
 feast, 28 f., 47, 49, 79, 162, 243, 292, 306.

Messianic kingdom, 30, 34, 37 f., 54, 86, 213, 236, 263, 267, 309, 321.
 separation, 125, 127, 157, 162, 284, 298, 315.
 woes, 133, 205, 297, 320.
 Offences, 41, 58, 223 f., 268, 282.
 Pentecost, 169, 251, 327.
 Prayer, 33, 90, 397.
 Probation, future, 361, 370.
 Ransom, 86, 109 ff., 137, 244.
 Re-birth, 333 f., 373, 392.
 Resurrection, 5 f., 89, 209 ff., 309 ff., 346 f.
 of righteous, 212 ff., 226 f., 236, 310, 369 ff.
 Riches, 40, 84, 221 f., 398.
 Sabbath, 14, 185 ff., 193.
 Satan's kingdom, 61, 71, 317 ff.
 Shut door, 48, 53, 161 f., 164, 225, 256, 286, 289 ff.
 Son of David, 39 f., 254.
 Son of man, 6 f., 93 ff., 335 ff., 361 ff., 389 ff.
 sign of, 125, 156.
 Suffering Messiah, 98 f., 112, 117, 120.
 Servant, 95, 100, 108 f., 194, 202, 218, 302, 326.
 Three days, 99, 107, 142, 173, 238, 305.
 Thrones, 23, 155, 263.
 Treasuries, 235, 241, 371.
 Universalising, 18, 24 f., 47 f., 51, 139 ff., 168, 212, 214 f., 218 f., 228, 286, 299 ff., 310, 313 f., 330 f., 353 f., 359 f., 384.
 Woes, on Cities, 197 f., 256 ff., 274 f., 313.
 on Pharisees, 32, 65 f., 253 f., 273.
 Words, 260 f., 272 ff., 315.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

DATE DUE

JUN 2 78

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

232.1R
W733

Winstanley, E.W., D.D.

AUTHOR

Jesus and the future.

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
		1892 07 28

232.1R
W733

